THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

In a civilization such as ours, where the conditions of human togetherness are being continually altered by powerful technical processes and where the demands of justice are becoming increasingly complex, is there any resource in Biblical faith for the problems of community? How may that faith help men to organize or reorganize their common life? This is the question which Reinhold Niebuhr considers in one of the later chapters of a recent volume—*The Self and the Dramas of History*.[1]

Needless to say Niebuhr holds that the seemingly irrelevant Biblical faith is indeed relevant to the social situation. He begins by observing that in so far as modern men have found some solution of their social problems, and achieved communities marked by a measure of individual freedom together with justice and stability, they have drawn upon both the Hebraic and the Hellenic elements in our culture, finding both the Biblical and the classical equally necessary. At its best the former guarded freedom and responsibility and introduced a sense of the dramatic quality of history, while the latter introduced the disciplines of rational discrimination which religious dogmas tended to obscure. At their worst the two forces of piety and rationalism introduced similar errors into the social situation. Ideally the worship of the true God emancipates man from the worship of self, whether individually or collectively; but in the course of history religion too easily becomes perverted by a fanaticism which identifies the absolute will of God with some contingent value such as a pretended Christian civilization which is in fact shot through with moral ambiguities. Ideally the absolute dictate of reason should make for reasonableness and should dissolve all irrational claims and privileges and suppress self-interest for the sake of the common weal; but, in fact, it has proved as easy to identify the interest of the self with some right or value as to identify it with the will of God. For example, it seemed that the two principles of liberty and equality could both be rationally justified. The middle classes, however, preferred to stress liberty because they wished freedom to pursue their economic activities, while the working classes preferred equality because they had conceived resentments, partly justified, against the hierarchical structure of society. Thus the two principles which might have been expected to work in harmony proved to be in conflict to an extent hurtful to the unity of most Western societies. In short, reason can be as obedient a servant of particular interests as religion, despite the fact that in both faith and reason there is implied an absolute, a truth transcendent to interest. More dangerous, however, than the claim to have reached final truth is the claim to have realized the final consummation in history—what our author calls modern utopian pretensions and illusions.

Nevertheless we cannot do without either the Hebraic-Christian component of our culture or the Hellenic-Renaissance contributions such as rational discrimination in the analysis of historical causes. Modern Western history has been a dramatic encounter between these two components, and the tension between them is rooted in the fact that each realizes some facts of human existence and tends to be blind to others. The Hebraic sees history as a drama and the Hellenic looks for the structures underlying the stream of history. The Hebraic is conscious of the organic aspects of human community while the Hellenic fastens on the elements of artifact which human contrivance has introduced. The Hebraic, conscious of the creatureliness of man, has a sense of Divine providence ruling over history, while the Hellenic in its modern form is so conscious of man's creativity that it lacks the sense of providence and alternates between excessive determinism and excessive voluntarism.

Both religion and rationalism, as we have observed, are liable to be corrupted by fanaticism, and the corruptions are similar in that both illustrate the tendency of finite man to think of himself more highly than he ought to think. What is needed is that the pride of man should be challenged by a prophetic religious faith which insists that all men and all cultures are under a more ultimate judgment than any of the judgments they pass on themselves or on each other. While the pious seek to moderate pretensions by insisting on man's subjection to God, the rationalists seek to bring them under critical social scrutiny; and both are necessary.

The chief issue, however, between the two components of our culture appears in connexion with the realization of the potentialities of history.

[1] Faber and Faber; 21s. net.

Biblical faith looks for no completeness of historical meaning or achievement in history. It may even anticipate a growth of both good and evil so that the contradictions of history are rather increased than diminished. Modern rationalism, on the other hand, assuming at this point more confidence than the Greek philosophers could muster, seeks to bring history to a rationally intelligible conclusion. Such utopian dreams merely introduce new evils, for the proposed fulfilment of history turns out to be merely the pretension of some class or nation or group that its cherished values must triumph over all others. Some of our contemporaries, for example, imagine the defeat of Communism to be history's true end, forgetting that some of the evils of Communism are derived from the fact that it regards Capitalism as the final stage of evil and anticipates its liquidation as the great end. It is significant, says NIEBUHR, that so much evil is born of these attempts to bring history to a premature conclusion—attempts which are based on the idea that the true end of history is now known to man. It is here again that the great service of Biblical faith comes to light. We need it ' to encourage the modesty and patience which will prevent the present tensions from becoming catastrophic because the contestants, one or both, are trying to bring history to a premature conclusion.'

In *The Congregational Quarterly* for April, 1956, is a very interesting article by Mr. Edward BEAL on ' Honesty in Preaching.' He did not need almost to apologize for what he feared would be felt to be an incongruity in the collocating of the words ' honesty ' and ' preaching.' Nearly all preachers, especially beginners, know that there are some very real problems as to how one can be honest in preaching. First there is the problem aroused by the ugly word ' plagiarism.' How far in a sermon can one legitimately make use of material gathered from other men's sermons read or heard? The output of sermonic literature has been and still is very great. Beyond question it is ministers who constitute the great bulk of purchasers. Well, there is no problem about the preacher who ' lifts ' a printed sermon in its entirety or in large part and reproduces it as his own composition. He is a plagiarist and deserves serious dealing from his ecclesiastical superiors. One is glad to believe that such flagrancy is of rare occurrence. The real problem which troubles the conscientious preacher is more difficult. Can he honestly use the thought or some of the thought of what he has read? Mr. BEAL has wise things to say about that. What book was ever written that did not owe much to thoughts already expressed in previous books? The very reason, surely, for publishing a book is to contribute to common thought and make it a public possession. He will make many a book reviewer smile over what he says about the stern warning often prefixed to a new book that no part may be reproduced without permission ; and then the reader finding how much the sacrosanct new book itself contains of what had been published before, and is perfectly familiar. A preacher would set himself an impossible and calamitous task if he aimed at saying in the pulpit what nobody had said before. Mr. BEAL might have remarked that even Jesus did not say much that was quite ' original ' and unfamiliar.

The next problem arises from the oft-repeated criticisms—ministers do not preach what they believe, or they do not themselves believe what they preach. This is, however, a real difficulty which does perplex preachers. Phillips Brooks pointed to it long ago : ' Almost any company of clergymen will express opinions which would greatly surprise and at the same time relieve their congregations. . . . It is dangerous and wrong to teach people what we have ourselves ceased to believe.' Now one cannot think that any minister would be quite so dishonest as to teach positively what he does not believe. The temptation is to keep silence ; so that the hearers do not know but that the preacher holds the old view say as to the absolute inerrancy of the Bible. They may gather elsewhere that views as to the authorship and date of some Books of Scripture have profoundly altered and because the minister has not frankly told them they come to distrust him. One whom we may call our own Mr. William Barclay has said ' it is one of the tragedies of the Church that there is so little attempt to teach people new knowledge, new approaches, new thought.' It may ' hurt the lethargy of the lazy mind and the embattled prejudice of the closed mind. But the task remains.'

Lastly, there is the difficulty of facing the truth in the criticism—ministers do not practise what they preach. Which of us would not humbly confess—alas ! it is too true. Jesus alone completely practised what He preached. St. Paul feared that though he preached to others he himself might be a castaway. Mr. BEAL encourages us. ' The fact that a preacher who is fighting his own peculiar battles, maybe with poor success, is compelled to admit himself to be a broken reed is in no sense an obstacle to prevent his calling on others to fight their battles. It has been said with truth that wisdom is the art of demanding that others shall do better than ourselves. To aver that because a man has sinned he has no right to preach may be a grave misjudgment. He is just the man to preach, if he is conscious of his sin and struggling to rise above it.'

Expository Problems

The Transfiguration

By Professor G. B. Caird, D.Phil., McGill University, Montreal

I

The Transfiguration is at once the commentator's paradise and his despair. Every detail of the story is surrounded by so great a wealth of association that explanations can be multiplied without departing from the bounds of probability. But to reduce this multiplicity to a unity is a task so formidable as to offer little prospect of success. Already within New Testament times a variety of interpretations had been put forward, each of which must have its place in the total picture. Mark (9^{2-8}), our primary source, presents by itself a sufficiently complex problem of exegesis. But we have to reckon also with the contributory ideas of four other authors. Matthew (17^{1-8}) and Luke (9^{28-36}), in adapting Mark's story to their own purposes, have contrived to make their distinctive comments upon it. The Second Epistle of Peter (1^{16-18}) represents yet another point of view. And in 2 Co 3^{18} Paul, without actually referring to the Transfiguration of Christ, uses the words 'glory' and 'transfigure' in the concluding sentence of a passage which draws a contrast between Moses and Christ.

Almost every item in the Marcan narrative can be made the starting-point of a theory. At the outset there is an unusually precise date. Whether this date is an accurate historical reminiscence or a subtle allusion to the six days spent by Moses on mount Sinai (Ex 24^{16}), there can be no doubt that Mark's main reason for mentioning it was to establish a connexion between the Transfiguration and the events which had happened shortly before at Cæsarea Philippi. In response to Peter's confession of faith Jesus had made a triple disclosure: that the Son of man must suffer and die, that His disciples must be ready to share in His divinely appointed destiny, and that His passion and their persecution must be seen against a background of ultimate and eternal glory. The scene which followed six days later on the mountain was the heavenly ratification of this new teaching, the seal of God's approval on Jesus' interpretation of His messianic calling. Luke draws attention to this aspect of the Transfiguration by one of his editorial additions, for he tells us that Moses and Elijah spoke with Jesus about the death which He was to accomplish in Jerusalem; and the Greek word for death (*exodus*) is one which carries overtones of Divine deliverance.

Mark's manner of telling the story might suggest that in his opinion the Transfiguration was a piece of dramatic instruction staged for the benefit of the three witnesses. 'He was transfigured *before them*. 'There appeared *to them* Elijah with Moses. 'There was a cloud that overshadowed *them*.' And the voice from the cloud addressed not Jesus but the disciples. There are indications, however, that this Marcan emphasis, important as it undoubtedly is, does not by any means contain the whole truth. The three disciples who accompanied Jesus are those who were with Him also in Gethsemane. Since on the latter occasion this inner circle of friends was chosen by Jesus to watch with Him through His night of prayer and to sustain Him by their presence through His Agony, it is a reasonable inference that the Transfiguration was for Jesus a critical moment in His career when He felt a similar need of companionship. Once again it is Luke who appreciates this point and emphasizes it by his characteristic addition that Jesus was praying at the time when He was transfigured. The course of modern discussion on this subject would seem to bear Luke out. The unearthly radiance of Jesus and the unearthly visitants with whom He held converse led a former generation of scholars to wonder whether this event really belonged to the earthly ministry of Jesus, and was not rather a misplaced Resurrection appearance, or even the product of Christological speculation in the Early Church. But the evidence presented by Evelyn Underhill and others, that physical transfiguration has been known to accompany the intense devotional experiences of saints and mystics, has persuaded more recent writers that such desperate devices are unnecessary. The Biblical story may be accepted at its face value, if we suppose that Jesus underwent an experience so momentous that His three companions were in some way caught up into it and enabled to participate in it.

The glorious appearance of Jesus was variously interpreted by the New Testament writers. It reminded Matthew of the transfiguration of Moses, and he introduced into his version of Mark's narrative verbal echoes of Ex $34^{29ff.}$. Alone of the Synoptists Luke used the word 'glory' in describing

the Transfiguration, and he associated it with the glory into which Christ was to enter by the Resurrection and Ascension and in which He would appear at the Parousia. To establish the connexion between these four events Luke employed two of his elaborate cross-references. The Marcan tradition had two men (Elijah and Moses) at the Transfiguration and one man in white at the empty tomb (Mk 16^5). Luke has two men at the Transfiguration, two men in white at the tomb (Lk 24^4), and two men in white again at the Ascension (Ac 1^{10}) ; and in each case he introduces them with the same phrase (' behold, two men '). The Marcan Parousia prediction, following Daniel, spoke of the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory (Mk 13^{26} ; cf. Dn 7^{13}). Luke puts the cloud in the singular, so that the Parousia cloud may be identified with the cloud seen at the Transfiguration and with that seen at the Ascension (Lk 21^{27} ; Ac 1^9). This connexion of the Transfiguration with the Parousia is further emphasized in 2 Peter, though without any reference to the Resurrection or to the Ascension. The author seems to have been acquainted with an independent tradition which treated the Transfiguration glory as a preview of the glory of the Parousia and an authentication of the Old Testament prophecies of the coming of the Lord. To Paul, on the other hand, the glory of Christ was an ever-present reality in the lives of Christians, since with the eyes of faith they could behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and in their lives they could reflect it, so as to be transfigured into the same likeness from one glory to another.

The heavenly voice adds two new associations to the story. The first clause—' This is My Son, the Beloved '—except that it is addressed to the disciples instead of to Jesus is identical with the words spoken from heaven at the Baptism of Jesus, and compels us to regard the Baptism and the Transfiguration as parallel events. In accepting baptism Jesus had chosen to be numbered with the transgressors in their need for repentance and remission of sins, and the voice from heaven had come to Him privately as the Divine approval of His choice. Now He has begun to reveal to His disciples the truth which He Himself had known since the outset of His minstry, that the Son of Man must suffer and give His life as a ransom for the many ; and the voice from heaven comes to them to ratify this new revelation. The final words —' hear him '—take us back to the promise of Moses in Dt 18^{15} : ' The Lord thy God will raise up for thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, from thy brethren, like to me ; to him shall you listen.' Jesus, we are to understand, bears an authority which is to replace that of Moses, and when the voice has spoken, Moses and Elijah have disappeared, and Jesus is seen alone.

It would seem, therefore, that a satisfactory explanation of the Transfiguration must do justice to its connexion with the Baptism, Cæsarea Philippi, Gethsemane, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Parousia ; and with the persecution of the disciples and their share, present and future, in the glory of the risen and ascended Christ. Nor must we forget that, with all its associations, the Transfiguration had an importance of its own as a crisis in the life of Jesus.

II

Up to this point I have deliberately omitted any reference to the one point in the story on which Mark saw fit to comment—Peter's proposal to make three tabernacles. Mark does not often introduce a comment of his own into the Gospel narrative, but when he does it always repays close study (cf. 3^{30} 7^{19} 13^{14}), and it is worth while to consider whether in this case his comment does not place in our hands the clue to guide us through the intricacies of our subject.

Having recorded Peter's suggestion Mark adds : ' He did not know what to say ; for they were awestruck.' In other words, Peter's offer was a very foolish one, which he would never have made if he had not been bewildered ; he simply blurted out the first thing that came into his head. Mark cannot have supposed that Peter was wanting merely to prolong a stupendous experience by means of a bivouac. The idea of the tabernacles was drawn from the story of Israel's sojourn in the wilderness where the tabernacle had been the shrine of the Divine glory, and Peter was proposing to build the tabernacles for three such manifestations of God's presence.

What was foolish about Peter's proposal ? Here before him were three men, each of whom could be regarded as a representative of the glory of God. Of Moses it was said that God spoke with him face to face as a man speaks with his friend. On mount Sinai his face had been transfigured with Divine radiance. Later legend declared that instead of dying he had been received up bodily into heaven. To others he had been God's mouth, and he held a unique place in Jewish theology as the giver of the sacred Law. He had predicted that God would raise up another prophet like himself, and when this prophecy was given a messianic interpretation, Moses himself came to be regarded as the prototype of the Messiah. In all these ways Moses could fairly be regarded as the embodiment of the old covenant, but he was also the foreshadower of the new. He had chosen to suffer reproach with the people of God rather than to enjoy the pleasures of

sin (He 11^{25}) ; he had stood alone before Pharaoh as champion of captive Israel, proclaiming God's redemption ; and he had stood alone before God as intercessor for sinful Israel, pleading that his own name might be blotted out from God's book as the price of their forgiveness (Ex 32^{32}). Elijah, too, had stood alone on mount Carmel, defending the honour of God against the priests of Baal, and on mount Horeb he had heard through the earthquake, wind and fire the small voice of stillness. His assumption to heaven was described in Scripture, and so great was the impression he left behind him that the last prediction of the prophetic corpus announced his return as forerunner of the Messiah (Mal 4^{5-6}). Out of the past, out of the heavenly sphere to which they now belong, come these two representatives of the old order to converse with the transfigured Jesus. Peter might well be excused for feeling that the Divine glory in all three modes of its manifestation should be provided with a permanent abode.

Nevertheless Mark's criticism of Peter (derived, perhaps, from Peter's later self-criticism) was sound. It was quite out of order to give Moses and Elijah a permanent position on the mount of revelation. There was no need for three tabernacles, nor even for one. For Jesus was Himself the new tabernacle of the Divine glory, who gathered up in His own person all the transient and fragmentary revelations of the past, transcending them all ; and before long the disciples were to see Moses and Elijah vanish and leave Jesus alone, with a voice from heaven declaring Him to be now the sole bearer of God's authority.

For all their greatness Moses and Elijah belonged to the old order, which was now giving place to a fuller and more adequate revelation of God's character and purpose. For all the splendour of their achievement they and the covenant within which they stood had failed. Subsequent events in the Gospels explain why it was that Moses and Elijah had to disappear. According to Mark, not long after his descent from the mount of Transfiguration Jesus was questioned about divorce, and He pointed out that Moses allowed divorce because he knew of no cure for the hardness of men's hearts, but that within the Kingdom, where a cure was available, no provision for divorce was necessary. This episode is followed in Mark's Gospel by the story of the rich man who, though he had kept the Law of Moses from his youth, had not been able to learn from it the one secret that could give him entry to the Kingdom. In Luke's Gospel the Transfiguration is followed by a journey through Samaria, during which the two Sons of Thunder were rebuked by Jesus for wishing to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritans as Elijah had done. In this respect Elijah was typical of the whole Old Testament attitude to the enemies of God and of His people. For the Old Testament offered life and blessing to the obedient, and atonement to those who sinned in ignorance and error ; but to those who wilfully opposed God it offered only God's curse. Now, however, the Law of Moses and the spirit of Elijah were both being rendered obsolete by the determination of Jesus to follow the way of the Cross and by His redemptive suffering to reveal God's way of dealing with sin.

III

At this point we must pause to ask what we mean when we say that Jesus revealed God. It is a commonplace to say that Jesus revealed God both in His teaching and in His life, death, and resurrection ; but the full implications of this double revelation are often overlooked. In his study of the Scriptures and in His private communion with God Jesus had come to know God as a loving Father whose purpose was to achieve the redemption of sinful men through the vicarious suffering of His chosen Servant. This knowledge He accepted for Himself at His baptism and began to impart to His disciples at Cæsarea Philippi. It was the truth : but it was a truth still abstract, a truth by which men had never lived, a truth as yet untested in the crucible of experience. It could not become revelation in the fullest sense until Jesus had verified it for Himself and demonstrated it to others. But this means that during the latter part of His ministry Jesus was living by a new and untried concept of God.

This point is vividly expressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Jesus is called ' the pioneer of our salvation ' (He 2^{10}). To compass man's salvation Jesus had to blaze a trail through spiritual territory hitherto unexplored. Greatly daring, the author goes on to add that ' He learned obedience through the things that He suffered, and being made perfect He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him ' (He 5^{8-9}). This does not mean, of course, that Jesus had to be taught to obey, for He always did that ; nor does it mean that He was ever morally imperfect ; but, in order that He might become the complete Saviour, He had to discover in His own experience what obedience to God implies when it is carried through to its ultimate limits in a world which has either repudiated or misunderstood the claims of the Divine sovereignty. This was the untrodden, unmapped country through which He must travel alone.

The Transfiguration marks the beginning of this journey of discovery. Up to this point Jesus has been following a path of obedience which others, to some extent at least, have travelled before Him.

been surrounded at every step by an cloud of witnesses, the goodly fellowship of prophets with whom He had so much in mmon that popular opinion took Him to be one of them. But now that He has set His face firmly to go to Jerusalem, He is the pioneer and must journey alone. This is the road which will lead Him to the Agony in the Garden and to the hour of even greater desolation on the Cross. He is entering a spiritual region where even Moses and Elijah can no longer bear Him company, and they come to talk with Him about the destiny that awaits Him, before bidding Him a solemn farewell.

IV

In His decision to accomplish at the cost of His life the redemptive work of the Father Jesus proves Himself to be the Son of God. But as Son He is also pioneer, and it is the function of the pioneer to open up a way along which others may travel after Him. Jesus is uniquely the Son of God, but He comes to lead many sons to glory. That is why the voice from heaven tells the disciples that they must listen to Him : they are to hear from Him the secret of sonship. They, too, must walk the road of obedience, though never alone as He was. They, too, must deal with evil in God's way, though not at the cost that He paid. They must reflect like a mirror the glory of the Lord and be transfigured into the same image from one glory to another.

What we call the Transfiguration of Christ is in a deeper sense the transfiguration of glory. For what happened on the mountain produced no change in Him who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. But it has transformed our conception of glory, by showing that our earthly standards of worth and greatness are as nothing in comparison with the glory of self-sacrificing love, and it has bidden us to set our hearts on the attainment of this one goal, with the assurance that, when all other objects of human endeavour have been swept away, the suffering and redeeming love of Christ will stand revealed as the ultimate and true glory of God. It is for this reason that the Transfiguration is not recorded in the Fourth Gospel. For to John the whole ministry of Christ, and the Cross in particular, was the revelation of that glory of the Father in which Jesus lived and into which He invited His disciples to enter.

The whole history of Christian ethics could be written as a commentary on the Transfiguration. For the Church has all too often acted on the proposal of Peter to build three tabernacles on the mount of God and to give to Moses and Elijah a permanent standing there alongside of Jesus. Time and again room has been found for legalism alongside of the ethics of grace, and the Church's enemies have been dealt with more in the spirit of Elijah than in the spirit of Jesus. Indeed, Elijah might to-day be regarded as the patron saint of the international policy which relies so heavily on calling down fire from heaven.

It has sometimes been said that our churches need a new Pentecost to fill them with the zeal and power of the Holy Spirit, but it may well be doubted whether Pentecost can ever precede the Transfiguration. The prior need is for a miracle of Divine grace to open our eyes that they may see Christ crucified as the sole revealer of the Divine glory, and to unstop our ears that they may hear the voice which declares from heaven : '*This* is my Son, the Beloved : listen to Him.'

Literature

THE PASTOR OF BUCHENWALD

A FREE translation by E. H. Robertson of the story of *Paul Schneider, the Pastor of Buchenwald,* as told by Paul Schneider's widow, together with many quotations from his diary and letters, has been published by the S.C.M. (8s. 6d. net). It is the story of a martyr and, therefore, a thrilling tale.

There was nothing special about Paul Schneider except for the fact that he was a man who 'could not disobey Christ.' Although his country martyred him, he loved his country. 'The tie which binds us to our native hills,' he wrote in his diary, 'may be overcome, but is never lost.' He was not a brilliant student. He went to work in a factory in order to get to know ordinary people better. 'I am going to Dortmund. There in my own body I shall feel the trials and privations of the worker. . . . I know, too, that as I work beside them, I shall learn to love them more.' When he left the factory one of the workmen said to him : 'You are one of us. Try to stay like that.'

Paul Schneider worked at his preaching. 'It is now clear to me,' he wrote, 'that it is absolutely necessary to think through the text and study its background carefully. Conversion alone is not enough to make a Christian.' He was a man of prayer. 'He fought his battles on his knees in his own room.'

It was actually on the matter of Church Discipline that he came into collision with the Nazi Party. 'Church discipline is like the sinews of the

Church. If these sinews are cut, the whole body is without strength.' He could easily have bought safety at the price of silence or at the price of acceptance of the banishment from his parish which was imposed upon him and which he refused to obey. His was the highest kind of courage. Not in the heat of the moment, but in calm deliberation he faced torture and death. The last words of his last sermon were : ' The Lord who goes before us to the cross, he will also strengthen us and keep us from evil. If we lose our life here for him, he will keep it unto everlasting life. He will let us see glory here and there. Then through suffering we shall find our way to glory, through the cross to the throne. We shall believe that, according to his word, we shall trust his promise, and, therefore, we shall give thanks to him with joy.'

His wife writes of him : ' My last sight of Paul was in the prison lorry. He went away from me smiling.'

Here is one of those books which has in it the authentic thrill of martyrdom. It will do any preacher's soul good to read this book—especially if he has grown flabby in his own witness for Christ.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THE UNITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

With the publication of *Christ and the Church* (Dacre Press ; 18s. net), Fr. L. S. Thornton, C.R., D.D., has brought to completion the great work on which he has been engaged for many years and so crowns a career of peculiar distinction. Here is the third and concluding part of the trilogy ' The Form of the Servant,' which, in the author's usage, refers to God in His total gracious activity towards creation. This volume has the same qualities which characterized its predecessors : wholeness of Biblical treatment, breadth of scope, high themes treated by a masterly hand holding complementary truths in delicate balance. Nor is it any easier to read than the former volumes. It calls for patience and concentration in the reader. Often, long passages have to be read, re-read, and read again in the attempt to grasp the meaning and follow the movement of thought. But, it must be added, the way is frequently made easier by passages of great beauty and luminous insight.

Again, with the use of new themes, and some themes taken up anew, Fr. Thornton's great concern is to demonstrate the unity of the revelation set out in the Bible. Here is the strongest reaction against the vestiges of the Liberal Protestant tradition which remain most clearly in the treatment of the Old Testament. No quarter is given to any idea of religious evolution. It is at this point that this book, and indeed all the author's recent writing, shows its strength and its weakness. For what Fr. Thornton has done to establish the unity of Holy Scripture no praise is sufficiently high. Yet in some the opinion grows, ungrateful as it may seem to say so, that at some points the price paid is too high. We cannot avoid the suspicion that at times Fr. Thornton overplays his hand ; especially where the argument turns on the use of typology. One example in this volume is the exposition of the metaphor of the Bride of Christ in terms of the New Eve—though the author would probably not allow the word ' metaphor.'

There are hints that the writer himself is conscious of the difficulty presented by typological exegesis, for example the recognition, in reference to the visions of the Apocalypse, that ' this general principle of interpretation will have very various implications in different instances.' The reviewer's mind goes back many years to the great occasion when he read Fr. Thornton's ' The Incarnate Lord,' which he still regards as his greatest book. That, too, was a hard book, but in a different way. At least the reader knew where he was going as he pressed on with the sustained and austere argument. The difficulty with this later method is to know always where one is being led.

This book is so important, both in itself and in the context of the ecumenical discussions centred on Christ and His Church, as to underline the need for some clear principles to govern the use of typology.

MARCUS WARD

PSYCHOLOGY AND WORSHIP

In his recent Burroughs Memorial Lectures—*Psychology and Worship* (S.C.M. ; 7s. 6d. net)—the Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, the Rev. R. S. Lee, has attempted to analyse, from the standpoint of the Freudian psychology, the relationship between human nature and the corporate worship of the average Christian. He does not defend theoretically the Freudian doctrines, especially of childhood, but applies them practically, and is thus led into wide-ranging observations of primitive religious customs as well as of the variety of the present day ritual of worship. He is naturally most concerned with the Anglican form of worship, but the width of his interests gives freshness and pointedness to his efforts to rescue customary worship from rigidity and meaninglessness. One of his favourite words is ' clarification ' and he is usually, although not always, successful in the endeavour thus indicated.

He is confident as regards the possibility of an objective basis for worship, and finds this in the natural aspirations of human beings everywhere. Man may be defined as a ' worshipping animal,' a phrase full of significance for the general attitude of the book. The criterion of advance is that

worship gradually comes to concern itself with the whole personality, material and spiritual. He is very respectful to the earliest expressions of religious longings in the race as well as in the individual, especially in childhood. The helplessness of the child, for example, reappears in the frequent current view of religion as an escape from toil and trouble. Effective use is made throughout his treatment of the Freudian conception of the *id*, the *super-ego*, the *ego*, and the *ego*-ideal, although the concepts in themselves are not precisely defined.

The best chapters are those on 'Prayer' and 'The Holy Communion.' In the first of these the author follows the wording of the Lord's Prayer, traces the development from self-centredness to unselfishness in petition, and urges that group-worship should always aim at heightening and not lowering the importance of the individual. His prevailing trend of thought lends freshness to his discussion of Holy Communion, and the last paragraph of the book is particularly beautiful. His range in time is long, and he believes that, though we have outgrown the religious customs of our primitive ancestors, something has been indefeasibly handed down through the centuries. Those who have read the whole book carefully will not be shocked at his suggestion that the 'eating of the god' is an idea not wholly alien to the culminating form of our modern Christian worship. He thinks also that concentration of attention at the Communion on the sufferings of Christ fails to appreciate fully His joyous participation in the simpler experiences of life as lived by His disciples in their community. Christ, he points out, was not merely a sacrificial victim but a conqueror—'The Cross overshadows and blots out His life and His full rich human nature. . . . The obedience of Christ unto death was only one element of His character. We need it, but we need also the infinity of His love and compassion, His humour, His courage, His simplicity.' In an earnest appeal, finally, the book lays stress on the necessity of response on the part of the worshipper—his self-oblation—as the safeguard against the externalizing of ritual, and also a sublimation of the material to the spiritual, or rather the finding again of the spiritual in the material of a world hallowed by the Incarnation in it of the Christ, the Son of God the Creator.

W. S. URQUHART

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JUDAISM

The second series of 'Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion' was delivered by Professor David Daube of the University of Oxford. They are now published under the title of *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (Athlone Press; 45s. net).

The book is divided into three sections. Part I. deals with 'Messianic Types.' The chapter on Ruth and Boaz is valuable for its exegesis of the Book of Ruth and for its approach to the miracle of the Feeding of the Multitude in the Gospels. Part II. deals with 'Legislative and Narrative Forms.' Here there is shrewd criticism of the *Formgeschichte* school. This is achieved by the method of reconstructing the Rabbinic background. How living and concrete become the controversies and discussions recorded in the New Testament! Part III. is more technical. Its theme is 'Concepts and Conventions.' The theological interest is well to the fore, as will be seen from the titles of some of the chapters, for example, 'Rabbinic Authority,' 'Redemption,' 'Violence to the Kingdom,' 'Abomination of Desolation,' 'The "I am" of the Messianic Presence.'

There are several characteristics of this work which raise it to the level of the highest importance for the Biblical scholar. First, it gathers together much material largely inaccessible to the Christian reader. Secondly, the author has been able to distinguish clearly between what is important and what is less important. Also the differences and resemblances between Jesus and His critics are set in a clear light. For example, the question of the Messiahship of Jesus is given its truly central place. Thirdly, the discussion of the relation between the New Testament and Judaism is firmly anchored in an intimate knowledge of Judaism as a whole, *i.e.*, a Judaism wide enough to include the Rabbinic and Hellenistic, as well as the smaller sects. Fourthly, a scholarly mind pervades the whole work. Even when Professor Daube differs from C. H. Dodd or Strack-Billerbeck, his comments are always fair and courteous.

This work is a valuable contribution to Biblical theology. It supplies ample evidence to show the truly organic relation between the New Testament and Judaism. But, of no less importance, it also demonstrates why the Early Church was forced to create a literature that was distinct from the literature of Rabbinism.

JAMES WOOD

MARTIN LUTHER

Nearly four years ago we hailed the first volume of *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther* as the new Wace and Buchheim. Now we welcome the second volume, entitled *The Spirit of the Protestant Reformation*, translated with Introduction and Notes from the Definitive Weimar Edition by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf (Lutterworth Press; 31s. 6d. net).

Most of the material in this volume belongs to the years 1519 to 1521 which saw Luther's burning

of the papal bull and the canon law and his appearance at the Diet of Worms. That extends the period covered in the first volume by less than a year; hence there is no chronological table, but as before there is an appendix each for personal names, subjects and Scriptural references and allusions.

An important section deals with Luther at Worms. It includes the contemporary documents, among them the letter which Luther wrote to the Emperor two days after leaving Worms, and from these we may learn both the facts of that dramatic occasion and Luther's feelings at the time. Nowhere else in English is this material available, and for that alone the translator and publishers are to be thanked. There is, however, much else, for example, Luther's exposition of the Magnificat, three sermons preached after the summons to Worms, and certain of his Biblical Prefaces, including those to the Epistle to the Romans and to the Psalms.

We rejoice that Luther's thought should now have a better chance than ever before of becoming known among us, especially since his immense command of Scripture is evident on almost every page of the writings translated here. We learn with anticipation that a third volume is on the way.

STEWART MECHIE

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The Lutterworth Press is to be congratulated on including Professor John Bright's *The Kingdom of God in Bible and Church* in their increasingly valuable Lutterworth Library (30s. net). This excellent book was first published by the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press under the title 'The Kingdom of God: The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning for the Church,' and was very favourably reviewed in these pages by Professor C. R. North in the issue for February, 1954. Let me at once endorse Professor North's warm recommendation of the book as a balanced and moving account of the Kingdom of God as the unifying theme of the Bible.

Professor Bright devotes some hundred and seventy-two pages to the Old Testament and to the New Testament some fifty-seven pages. From these proportions the intention of the book can be divined. The greater space is given to the Old Testament because it is, so to speak, the laboratory of the New Testament. The Old Testament records a story and traces a life which lasts long enough to show what happens to a people which believes itself to possess a divine destiny in the world.

Such a record is important in itself, because it inevitably shows the successes and the failures of such a progress in history. Therefore by its nature the Old Testament is, as Professor Bright points out, an incomplete book. It requires a sequel and a fulfilment, for it points to a story and a life in which the divine calling and destiny were not only glimpsed but also fulfilled.

It is, however, not merely a question of incompleteness, and here I think I would go beyond Professor Bright. The Old Testament points out, and indeed shows, Israel travelling along a number of paths that turn out to be dead ends, and Israel did not give up travelling until she came to the ends. So the Old Testament preserves for us those perverse ideas and that sinful behaviour which could not in Old Testament times serve the Kingdom. In this sense the Old Testament partakes of the character of Anti-Christ for it shows the record of the denial and the defiance of the Kingdom. Would that some of our docetic typologists would remember that the Old Testament is Anti-Christ as well as before Christ. But the Old Testament is no longer Anti-Christ, for it now serves to show the Church that to take certain political forms, to embrace certain priestly methods and to follow certain apocalyptic ideals is to lose the Kingdom.

The Old Testament, however, does not merely serve as a warning. Though it is the record of a life that failed, it nevertheless succeeded in bequeathing out of the failure a legacy of possibility, notions, and titles, and even patterns that were to be embraced by Jesus and used by His Church. Just as the Second Isaiah rescued from the perished royal Israel a mission that was universal, Servant and vicarious, so the Old Testament, as a whole, transmits a real Messianism first apprehended and applied and fulfilled by Jesus. Jesus so used and interpreted the Old Testament as to make it inevitable that the Old Testament should become part of the Christian Scriptures.

Professor Bright's book clearly shows how the Old Testament with its account of the tragedy of Israel yet became the charter document for Jesus' thinking about the Kingdom of God and His rôle in that Kingdom.

G. HENTON DAVIES

Some Christian Words, by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.Litt., Dean of St. Paul's (Allen and Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is a most excellent book within its own self-prescribed limits. The book consists of broadcast addresses on thirteen great Christian words, together with three talks on Jesus' Thought about Himself. It would be difficult to imagine any series of talks which would better fulfil the purpose for which they were designed. Naturally one does not look for extensive linguistic discussion in a book like this,

but for all that it is obvious that the book is written with a background of full and careful knowledge. The book is much more concerned to bring out the religious and theological meaning of these words. There are discussions of the meaning of the resurrection of the body and of the meaning of hell which are most helpful, and which say with clarity and brevity more than many volumes of many times their size. This is a book for which the ordinary, non-technical Bible student will have profound cause to be grateful.

In 1955 the Baker Book House brought out the two volume 'Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,' which was designed to be a supplement to bring up-to-date the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Of this new supplement one section has now been published as a separate volume—*The Text, Canon, and Principal Versions of the Bible*, by Elmer E. Flack, Bruce M. Metzger, and others (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids; $1.50). Even in its new form this is an actual reprint of these sections from the larger work. It must be remembered that this work does not deal in any sense fully with the subjects of its title, but only brings up-to-date the material in the older work. It does so extremely well; and, if for no other reason, it is most valuable for its very full and up-to-date bibliographies.

Many who seek to broaden and deepen in congregations and Bible classes the conception of the World Church will be grateful to the Rev. William Lillie, D.D., for his clear presentation of the present situation in *Jesus Shall Reign* (Church of Scotland Youth Committee; 6s. net). He brings to his task experience gained from a long and distinguished missionary career in India, and, more recently, from contacts with students of our home universities. Of the three divisions of his book the central part is factual, giving an account of the widespread missionary activities of the Church of Scotland. The first part is an analysis of the ideal for the Church, an expansion of his fundamental attitude that 'it requires some faith and some courage to say that we believe in "one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church",' for the reason that so many amongst the members of the Church are distressed by the disunity of the Church, rather critical of the claim to 'Holiness,' and unable to define with any clarity what is meant by 'Catholic' and 'Apostolic.' The last part is very practical and tries, with much success, to combine the ideal and the actual with reference to the opportunities of the local congregation. The author shows how much can be done to break down national and racial barriers by utilizing the possibilities for friendship which are nearest to us, by emphasizing constantly the responsibility for Christian loyalty laid upon those who go out from our homes to distant lands in any capacity whatsoever, and the need also to listen with serious attention to specific appeals for missionary commitment.

Dr. Lillie's book will retain throughout the interest of his readers; it is no mere catalogue of activities or doctrinaire exposition of an ideal. His style is easy and natural, illumined by experience, and lightened ever and again by attractive touches of humour.

The Rev. Lewis Maclachlan already has two useful books on Prayer to his credit, and now he has written another—*How to Pray for Healing* (James Clarke; 6s. net cloth; 3s. 6d. net paper). Recognizing that effective prayer must be both enlightened and disciplined, he writes to help those who pray to fulfil the conditions upon which it is efficacious for healing. Numerous examples, sufficiently disguised, are quoted; and one feels all along that the author is writing simply and clearly out of a wide experience. This is a wise and helpful book.

We are beginning to await with eagerness the appearance of new religious titles in Collins' 'Fontana Books.' The latest volume to emerge is *The Divine Pity*, by the Rev. Gerald Vann, O.P. (Collins; 2s. net). This is a lovely and valuable book containing a 'Study in the Social Implications of the Beatitudes.' We are grateful that it is now obtainable at so cheap a price. It might be well worth the publisher's time to invite from the public suggestions as to what books they would wish to see republished in this series, for this is an experiment in religious publishing of the first importance.

Christian Social Ethics, by Mr. Bertrand J. Coggle and Mr. John P. K. Byrnes (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d.), is intended primarily as a text book for correspondence classes of the Methodist Study Centre; but we welcome it as a useful introduction to a wide and complex field of practical importance, and we commend it to leaders of young people's organizations as well as students. Subjects dealt with include Home and Family, The Economic Order, Politics, International Relations, Leisure and the special problems of Alcohol and Gambling.

The authors rely too much on the late Lord Stamp, who was strangely blind to some matters of both economic and moral importance. Let them ask themselves why public debt, both national and local, has increased steadily for the last two centuries both in war and in peace. They have written a good book: when they can answer that question they may write a better.

Mrs. Edith Anne Robertson has finely accomplished a daring *tour de force* by translating into her remarkable canon of pure Scots vocabulary and cadence one-and-twenty of Mr. Walter de la Mare's widely beloved poems, with the older poet's approval and admiration expressed in his Foreword to the little volume—*Poems Frae the Suddron o Walter De La Mare* (M. MacDonald, Edinburgh; 3s. 6d. net).

The issue of this little book is accompanied by that of a slightly larger—*Voices Frae the City o Trees* (M. MacDonald; 5s. net)—containing thirty-two of the author's own poems in the same alluring language. The beautiful old diction of the North-East cries to the heart.

Some words, lines, lyrics will haunt till 'seas gang dry.'

> We flow whaur flows aneath the sheer
> Barber-like clefts o historie,
> A river rowean til yon sea
> Whase solemncholy faas we hear.

Dr. René Pache, Principal of Emmaus Bible School, Lausanne, trained in law, then a business man, and all the time a complete sceptic, was converted to ardent Christian faith and became a far-travelled evangelist. He wrote a book which we now have in English, competently translated by J. D. Emerson—*The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit* (Marshall, Morgan, and Scott; 10s. 6d. net). It is in five sections, treating in turn with Who is the Spirit?, His Work before Pentecost, His Work in the Heart of Man since Pentecost, The Spirit and Service, and His work in the Future. It does not seem that the author was ever at Keswick, but his book is wholly in the Keswick tradition. There is nothing new except the clear individual expression of familiar truths, but the special spiritual pilgrimage of the writer adds interest.

A valuable find was made by Professor Raymond Klibansky in Edinburgh University Library in the shape of translations of and introductions to some of Plato's works from the hand of the late Professor A. E. Taylor. Part of those are now published—*Plato, Philebus and Epinomis* (Nelson; 21s. net). Professor Klibansky has been ably assisted in dealing with Taylor's manuscripts by Professor Guido Calogero, who edits 'Philebus' and Mr. A. C. Lloyd, who edits 'Epinomis.' All students of Plato will rejoice that Taylor's invaluable work has been rescued from oblivion. Another volume is on the way, containing his translations of 'Sophistes' and 'Politicus.'

Mr. Harry Blamires gives us what he modestly describes as an essay but which will be found to be a very penetrating study in *The Faith and Modern Error* (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net). It unfolds the baffling problem which confronts and dismays every preacher of the gospel—the existence of a seemingly impenetrable barrier of apathy and indifference. Not only have we to deal with criticisms of what we preach, there are multitudes who are not interested enough in the topics we handle even to criticize our treatment of them. Mr. Blamires adduces reasons for this apathy. Many factors have contributed to it. Many people are interested only in the here and now. As to a life beyond, they just could not care less. How are we to deal with them? None of us has an answer. Mr. Blamires has not one. The problem is how to get the ear of those people. A popular evangelist may draw crowds by the thousand, but who are they? It is quite certain that a very small proportion ever comes from the class of the apathetic.

The author has some wise things to say on wrong remedies sometimes suggested. It is all wrong to hold that one great obstacle lies in the allegedly archaic or too technical terms of our traditional creeds or liturgies. The extent to which that is a hindrance is easily exaggerated. The common man does not really feel the linguistic difficulties we sometimes impute to him. It is not that he does not understand, it is just that he does not believe. He has no place for the Supernatural in his scheme of things. The Church gains nothing by watering down the Supernatural which it is her function to proclaim. Her duty is to hold forth the Supernatural as something not reducible to the natural, but of a higher order to which the spiritual nature of man himself belongs.

From a rural parsonage in Oxfordshire comes a little book by the Rev. Leslie Badham, M.A.—*Love Speaks from the Cross* (The World's Work; 7s. 6d. net). As one might guess from the title, the book is a series of addresses on the Seven Sayings of our Lord on the Cross. It is good, plain, straightforward preaching, and is likely to be profitable not only to the preacher but to other Christians.

Not every Christian is articulate about his or her religion, and not every articulate Christian can speak the language of the teen-agers. Here is a book by one who can—*Never a Dull Moment*, by Eugenia Price (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids; $2.00). It sets out to answer with Scriptural authority fourteen questions actually asked by young people, such as, Why bother about God?, How can I become a Christian?, How can I ever like to read the Bible? The answers are clear and conversationally expressed and lit up by the authoress's own Christian experience.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

IX. The Servant of the Lord—(*Continued*)

By Lektor D.Theol. Curt Lindhagen, Nyköping, Sweden

Individual Interpretation. The individual interpretation also still appears with numerous variants. Individual-historical theories have clearly lost ground, while the messianic, on the other hand, has won increasing support and in some cases been combined with the individual-historical as well as with the collective. If the individual Servant can be represented as a corporate personality, 'Israel in person' (Delitzsch), the boundary between individual and collective easily becomes fugitive.

(a) *Historical-Individual Interpretation.* The autobiographical interpretation revived by S. Mowinckel in 1921, according to which the Servant is Deutero-Isaiah himself, and which—with or without variations—won a number of adherents in the 1920's and 1930's, but was abandoned by Mowinckel himself, has now relatively few advocates, of whom A. Weiser [1] and E. L. Allen [2] may be mentioned. It is partially held by Kissane [3] for the third and by Sidney Smith [4] for the second, third, and fourth Songs. According to Martin Buber Deutero-Isaiah felt himself to be 'one of the figurations of the Servant . . . for whom the very work of the redemption of world history was reserved.' [5]

Some scholars, such as A. Bentzen, H. W. Wolff, and W. Zimmerli, have combined the autobiographic interpretation with messianic elements.

Bentzen's [6] final position is very complicated. He adheres to his agreement, expressed in 1928, with Mowinckel's 1921 position, but at the same time emphasizes that Deutero-Isaiah as the Servant is a Moses *redivivus* and to that extent exhibits messianic features, while at the same time he and his disciples take upon themselves Israel's prophetic mission to the world. 'Ebed Yahweh is both the Messiah and Israel and Deutero-Isaiah and his band of disciples.' [7] Wolff,[8] who likewise identifies the Servant with Deutero-Isaiah, sees in the Servant-figure 'a prototype of Jesus Christ such as prophecy foretells.' [9] According to Zimmerli [10] the Servant-figure in Is 53 goes far beyond Deutero-Isaiah's own person. The representation points towards the transcendent Servant of the future: the messianic interpretation of the LXX is thus justified.

Of scholars who see in the Songs, in whole or in part, another individual historical person than Deutero-Isaiah himself, S. Mowinckel, E. Burrows, and J. Coppens may here be mentioned.

Mowinckel [11] now sees in the Servant an anonymous Palestinian prophet of the Trito-Isaianic circle, in which we must also seek the author of the Songs.[12] Burrows [13] and Coppens [14] both associate the Servant-Songs with the Davidic dynasty; the Servant is thus a royal figure. According to Burrows the Servant relates to the house of David in the past, present, and future. The third and fourth Songs have in mind Jehoiachin, the Davidic prince of the Exile.[15] (The first and second relate to the house of David, or rather, perhaps, to the coming ideal king.) Coppens, on the other hand, would make the first three Songs refer to Zedekiah and the fourth to Jehoiachin. By inserting them in their present contexts Deutero-Isaiah gave to the Songs a more directly prophetic and messianic form. A typological-Christological interpretation is therefore justified.

[1] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [1939], 163 f.

[2] *Prophet and Nation* [1947], 120 f., 135 ff.

[3] *The Book of Isaiah*, ii. [1943].

[4] *Isaiah, Chapters XL.–LV.* [1944].

[5] *The Prophetic Faith* [1949], 230.

[6] *Jesaja*, i. [1944], viii.–xi.; ii. [1943], *ad locos; Messias, Moses redivivus, Menschensohn* [1948], 43 ff.; *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii. [1949], 110–13.

[7] For a searching analysis of Bentzen's *Messias*, see J. Coppens, *Miscellanées bibliques*, xxiv. [1951].

[8] *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum* [1942], 32 ff., 2nd ed. [1950], 35 ff.

[9] *Ib.*, 34. Cf. L. Goppelt, *Typos* [1939], 125 ff.

[10] Art. *pais theou* (Old Testament and LXX.), in *Theol. Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, v. [1953] 676 ff.

[11] *Han som kommer* [1951], 129–73; *Det Gamle Testamente*, iii. [1944], 192–201; *Ac. O.*, xvi. 1 [1937], 37–40; *Z.A.W.*, xlix. [1931], 245 ff., where the possibility that the Servant is Deutero-Isaiah is still left open.

[12] A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires* [1950], 117 (Eng. Tr., *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [1952], 96), sees in the Servant 'a pious Teacher who was martyred by Aristobulus II.' (67–63 B.C.!).

[13] *The Gospel of the Infancy* [1940], 59–80.

[14] *Nieuw Licht over de Ebed-Jahwe-Liederen*, Analecta Lovaniensia, ii. 15 [1950], 118 ff.

[15] A similar standpoint was maintained earlier by J. W. Rothstein, *Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin* [1902], 121 ff.; *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*, lxxv. [1902], 282–336.

With this we have come near, not to say crossed, the border to the messianic interpretation.

(b) *Messianic Interpretation.* How far the pre-Christian interpretation of the Suffering Servant was messianic or not is still a much disputed specialist problem.[1] That the messianic interpretation was characteristic of Jesus and the Early Church is, however, obvious.[2] The messianic interpretation was accepted practically unanimously until the 1770's, when an exilic date began to be asserted for Is 40 ff., and collective and individual-historical interpretations made their appearance. The messianic interpretation, which is still as good as universal in Roman Catholic exegesis, has recently, especially in Uppsala, been supported by arguments from sacral kingship. That it has to some extent influenced even collective and historical-individual exegesis, we have already seen. It is frequently emphasized, independently of the different lines of interpretation, that the deepest meaning of the Ebed Yahweh-Songs only becomes clear in their fulfilment in Jesus Christ.

The so-called Uppsala school has from the first shown great interest in the problem (Nyberg, Engnell, Widengren, Riesenfeld, Ringgren and others). Here also the most important characteristics of the school are evident: a strongly conservative treatment of the texts, with great confidence in the Massoretic text; an organic, tradition-historical view of the Old Testament writings; and emphasis upon their close connexion with the religious ideas of the ancient Near East. The royal-ideological pattern, worked out especially by Engnell and Widengren, has resulted in a more or less clearly defined messianic interpretation. Within this general framework there are, however, as elsewhere, obvious individual variations.[3]

H. S. Nyberg's important and comprehensive examination of Is 53 [4] is based upon a detailed philological and ideological analysis of the Massoretic text (which is nowhere altered but is often given new interpretations), the LXX, and the Targum. Nyberg's interpretation of the Suffering Servant is, above all, of a 'motif-historical' kind. He makes a synthesis of three separate motifs which had been recognized by earlier research, namely, the Tammuz-Adonis mystery, the kingly ceremonies at the New Year Festival in the month of Nisan, and the ancestor-motif. The cult-drama of the New Year Festival is only a variant of the Tammuz-motif, and the ancestor-ideology inherited from the nomadic period was so transformed in Canaan that the ancestor took on Tammuz or Adonis features and was identified with the king. And behind the ancestor stands his people. The usual contrast—individual *or* collective—is false. The Servant is Israel both in the sense of the tribal ancestor and the people that derives from him. In a later work [5] Nyberg has given to Is 53 a clear messianic interpretation, but the Messiah is of an altogether different type from the triumphant figure of old time.

Engnell [6] urges strongly that the Servant-Songs, seen motif-historically, are nothing other than a piece of royal ideology, messianism. They are, like the rest of Deutero-Isaiah, to which they organically belong, a prophetic imitation of a liturgy-complex belonging to the New Year Festival. The third and fourth Songs lead us back to the sacral king in his Tammuz-situation: his humiliation and vicarious suffering, his atoning death, and the victory of life through resurrection. Engnell finds the Israelite evidence for this cultic reality, with reference to A. R. Johnson,[7] in a number of royal passion-psalms in the Psalter which he calls 'psalms of the Ebed Yahweh-type.' Such Psalms are 18, 22, 49, 88 f., 116, 118, Is $38^{9ff.}$ and others. The Messiah of the Servant-Songs is depicted in these cultic categories. By organically relating Is 54^{1}–55^{13}, with its 'true mercies of David,' to 53^{12}, Engnell supports his thesis that the Servant is the Davidic Messiah. He finds a number of royal ideological motifs similar to those in the Songs both in Israelite and non-Israelite materials, the latter especially in Sumero-Akkadian and Ras Shamra texts. For the third and fourth Songs Engnell in this connexion makes extensive

[1] For a first introduction to this complicated problem, see H. H. Rowley's above-mentioned survey, 'The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah'; J. Jeremias, art. *pais theou* (late Judaism and N.T.) in *T.W.B.N.T.*, v. [1953]. (Rowley takes up a negative, Jeremias a positive standpoint.) See also Hegermann's work above-named [1954], and E. Sjöberg, 'Justin als Zeuge,' *Festschrift* Mowinckel [1955], 173–83.

[2] See also E. Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht und Davidsohn* [1945], 2nd. ed. [1953]; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht* [1955].

[3] For a detailed presentation of the Servant-exegesis of the Uppsala School—most of it in Swedish—and its academic and historical background, see my article in *S.E.Å.* (*supra*, p. 279, *n.* 11).

[4] *S.E.Å.*, vii. [1942], 5–82.

[5] *Gamla Testamentets urkunder*, Världsreligionernas kärnord [1944], 134 f.

[6] First in *S.E.Å.*, x. [1945], 31–65, published later in slightly revised form in English in *Rylands Bulletin*, xxxi. [1948], 54–93. Cf. also his *Studies in Divine Kingship* [1943], 48, *n.* 7, 62, *n.* 7, 77, 83, *n.* 5, 119, *n.* 7, 130, *n.* 6, 152, *n.* 1, 170, *n.* 4, 176, *n.* 4, 213. Cf. O. S. Rankin, *Z.A.W.*, lxiii. [1951] 268 ff.

[7] *The Labyrinth* [1935], 71–111, especially 100 f. See now also Johnson's great monograph, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* [1955], especially pp. 25, 104, 125.

use of the Tammuz liturgies published by M. Witzel in *Analecta Orientalia*, x. [1935]. So for Engnell the Servant-Songs are the Old Testament's most important and profoundest expression of its conception of the suffering, victorious and triumphant Davidic Messiah.

G. Widengren's [1] position is in all essentials in close agreement with Engnell's. He especially stresses the cultic humiliation of the king and the Tammuz-ideology as the principal components of the Servant-figure. H. Riesenfeld,[2] who also sees the Servant in the light of the sacral kingship, stresses among other things that the element of suffering in the royal ideology is original and that it recurs in Jewish messianology. G. Östborn [3] finds traits of kingship in the Servant's imparting of *tôrāh* to the heathen in Is 42[6], where the Servant appears as *nomos empsychos*. H. Ringgren,[4] on the whole, reproduces Engnell's point of view, but with considerably greater caution and stronger emphasis on the collective element, namely, the Israelite people whom the Servant incorporates in himself.

Recent Roman Catholic exegesis follows along the lines of such eminent scholars as Feldmann, Fischer, Vaccari, van der Ploeg, and others. It is still almost entirely Messianic-Christological.[5] A new and thorough re-examination of the Songs in the light of modern research has been made by R. J. Tournay,[6] who, in common with Rowley, asserts that just as the Servant-Messiah cannot be separated from the people whose foremost representative he is, so neither can Christ be separated from his *corpus mysticum*, the Church. The Franciscan V. de Leeuw [7] has, in two papers along motif-historical lines, maintained the messianic interpretation similarly to Nyberg and Engnell, and W. Goosens [8] has discussed the vicarious suffering of the Servant. That Coppens reached his messianic interpretation by way of Jehoiachin (cf. E. Burrows) and Zedekiah—much as Gressmann did in 1908 and 1929 by way of Josiah—we have already seen.[9]

Mention may be made of the messianic interpretations of E. J. Young [10] and D. Baron,[11] which are strongly orientated to the premiss that its New Testament fulfilment is regulative for the interpretation of the Old Testament.

We close with C. R. North's 'Critical Summary and Conclusion.' [12] After examining and rejecting the historical-individual, mythological, and collective interpretations, North himself decides for the messianic.[13] The Servant is an individual still to come. The Songs are myth in the sense of provisional or anticipated history, not allegory.[14] The Servant is not the Davidic Messiah of Is 9 and 11; he is a soteriological rather than a political-messianic figure. We may venture to believe that in the purpose of God the Servant-Songs were primarily intended to afford guidance to Jesus. 'Original and Fulfilment join hands across the centuries.' [15]

[1] *Religion och Bibel*, ii. [1943], 49–75; *Religionens värld* [1945], 222 f., 306, 353; 2nd ed. [1953], 229 ff., 311 f., 362; *S.E.Å.*, x. [1945], 66–81; *The King and the Tree of Life*, U.U.Å. [1951], iv. 53; *Sakrales Königtum* [1955], 30 f., 56, 58, 75.

[2] *Jésus transfiguré* [1947], *passim*.

[3] *Torā in the Old Testament* [1945], 57 f., 77 f.

[4] *Ny Kyrklig Tidskrift*, xviii. [1949], 75; *Z.A.W.*, lxiv. [1952], 139–47; *Messias konungen* [1954], 45–80. Cf. also G. A. Danell, *N.K.T.*, xviii. [1949], 87: 'The Servant, the Messiah, is the true Israel, the remnant, concentrated in one person.'

[5] E. J. Kissane, as we have seen, interprets the first and second Songs of Israel, the third of the prophet himself, but the fourth of the Messiah.

[6] *Revue biblique*, lix. [1952], 355–84, 481–512.

[7] *Analecta Lovaniensia*, ii. 33 [1933]=*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, xxviii. [1952], 449–71; *L'attente du Messie* [ed. B. Rigaux, 1954], 51–56.

[8] *Collationes Gandavenses*, xxxi. [1948], 10–29.

[9] Cf. also P. Heinisch, *Theologie des Alten Testamentes* [1940], 316 ff.; A. Feuillet, *Recherches de science religieuse*, xxxv. [1945], 412–441; R. T. Murphy, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, ix. [1947], 262 ff.; P. Dulau, *Le livre d'Isaïe* (Divus Thomas, Comment., iii. 24) [1947], 187; R. Koch, *Geist und Messias* [1950], 109.

[10] *The Westminster Theol. Journal*, xi. [1949], 155; *Isaiah 53* [1952] (which asserts the Isaianic authorship).

[11] *The Servant of Jehovah* [1954]. Cf. also A. H. Edelkoort, *De Christusverwachting in het Oude Testament* [1941], 372–436.

[12] *The Suffering Servant*, 192–219.

[13] *Ib.*, 207 ff.

[14] What North means by 'myth' he has explained more fully in 'The Interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah,' in *Festschrift* Mowinckel [1955], 133–45.

[15] *The Suffering Servant*, 219.

Religious Education

The 'Queen's Bible'?

By K. L. Carrick Smith, M.A., Headmistress, The Mount School, York

There can be few teachers and scholars to-day who deny the value of translations of the Bible in modern speech. Moulton, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Rieu, Knox, the Standard Version, the Revised Standard Version, Phillips' admirable paraphrases of the New Testament—all these are in use, and have their enthusiastic readers and advocates, and there is yet another translation being prepared by a carefully chosen panel of distinguished scholars. Most of us make considerable use of the Authorized Version along with whatever modern versions we prefer, while examining bodies continue in most cases to prescribe the text of the Revised Version. In this abundance there is evidence of deep and intelligent enthusiasm for the Bible, but we cannot afford to be complacent. The purpose of this article is to show that this rich diversity is in itself an obstacle which will prevent the Bible from regaining its hold upon the nation unless the churches act decisively, together and soon.

During the last War, vast numbers of pocket Gospels were distributed to the Forces *in the Authorized Version*—a foreign tongue to most of those who received it. Indeed, the language of the King James Bible is so strange to the man in the pub that we are nearly back in the days of the Vulgate, before Wyclif gave the nation a Bible which could be 'understanded of the people.' Recently a young married couple, of much above average education, were persuaded to attend a private study circle in a neighbour's house. When they had heard a passage read from one of St. Paul's epistles in Phillips' version (*Letters to Young Churches*) the husband exclaimed with delighted surprise, even with enthusiasm, 'Why, that *means something*!' To him, as to millions, the Authorized Version, the only Bible he had ever heard, meant nothing. To a few it is 'a splendour of accustomed sound'; to many more, an unfamiliar sound, the splendour of which they cannot perceive for want of literary discernment. To make matters worse, many of those who revere it have an attitude of mind towards the Bible which conceals from them the fact that they do not understand it, and even if they study it with goodwill the language cushions them against the impact of the message. Some Christian people are content to have it so!—they hate to discard a beautiful phrase even when shown that as a translation it is misleading. This surely is idolatry, a case of the letter killing.

'But,' it may be urged, 'matters are improving.' Certainly the religious teaching given in schools is more living, is undertaken with more care, and enjoys greater prestige than was the case twenty years ago. No doubt there are those who believe that, because teachers are making use of modern translations, and introducing their pupils to them, it is only a matter of time before intelligible versions come to be accepted and used generally by those who want to read and understand the Bible, but this is not enough. J. R. Green's pithy saying that in the seventeenth century 'England became the people of a Book, and that Book the Bible' is often quoted. Would it—could it—have been the same if Englishmen had been reading ten or a dozen different versions? I think not. When James I appointed the Bible of 1611 to be read in churches, it superseded its predecessors fairly rapidly, so that before long all men heard it read in the same language, all men quoted it in the same words. It is quite reasonable to regret that the Psalms as printed in the Book of Common Prayer (Coverdale's translation) are not verbally the same as when read in the Authorized Version. This makes them, for Anglicans, more difficult to memorize. If there were the same difference in respect of the Epistles and Gospels, the loss would be great indeed! Fortunately this is not so. For three hundred years the passages read by the fireside, or at table, in family worship have been identical in language with those which men have heard Sunday by Sunday in church or meeting. Every direct or indirect quotation has come to their ears loaded with the associations of previous use and hearing. *Provided that men understand what they hear and quote*, there is a tremendous gain to piety in this *verbal* identity between God's messages as we hear them to-day and as our forefathers heard them in days gone by, but we are almost certainly the last generation among whom will be found men and women who have an accurate verbal knowledge of even the most 'popular' passages in Scripture. If the Bible is to be common wealth to future generations as to those past, there must be an *agreed* twentieth century version used in churches, in schools and in the home. (This does not mean that we should

discontinue the use, for study purposes, of all other versions.)

The present writer warmly advocates having treasured passages of Scripture by heart, because they come to mind invaluably all through life, for guidance in times of doubt, and for comfort in times of stress. School days are the time for learning from the Bible. As things are, a teacher would hesitate to ask children to memorize any but the Authorised Version (or Revised Version), if only because these are the texts available in school; but it is difficult to be sure that they understand what they learn. What is needed is a version so generally accepted that Local Education Authorities would provide it for use in schools; but it should be the one which children hear also in church and in Sunday school.

The growing strength of the Ecumenical Movement among English-speaking people (as well as others), when seen in relation to the obsolescence of the King James' Bible, makes it an urgent matter that we should agree to adopt a common version. Anglicans, Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Quakers—when we meet together we often need to speak and pray in the words of Scripture: let us then use a version which is intelligible to the unlearned and common to us all. Biblical study no less requires it, except at the level where scholars quote Greek and Hebrew. One small point is none the less weighty: we cannot have concordances to every version in use, and a concordance is necessary to many kinds of study.

A Bible in language intelligible to all, *the same* in home, in school, and in church, in all churches, and in all liturgies—this is what is needed if England is to be again 'the people of a Book, and that Book the Bible.' Three steps are required: first, that the churches should take this subject seriously, and the British Council of Churches make it a priority matter to decide, under God's guidance, which version to adopt. (I should earnestly hope that not only the churches in Britain, but all English-speaking Christendom could come to agreement in the matter.) Secondly, if the existing Bible societies cannot use their funds to subsidize cheap editions of the modern version to be adopted, new money must be subscribed to do so. Finally, steps must be taken to commend the new Bible to the people in a way that will win their attention and kindle their feelings. The word *authorized* has no attraction to-day; an Act of Parliament, if that were possible (and the fate of the 'deposited' Prayer Book does not encourage one to hope that it would be) inspires little confidence or enthusiasm; but if Her Majesty the Queen would allow her name to be used, the new Bible would stand above politics, party, and denominations. King James' Bible was published in 1611; would that *The Queen's Bible* might appear in 1961! Christians can see no hope for the world except in a fresh outpouring of God's Holy Spirit to renew the face of the earth; but no such renewal is likely without a return to the Scriptures—not to the letter blindly accepted, for the Spirit who gave forth His word through men's minds still interprets it to their understanding, and will continue to do so. But it is not enough for scholars and teachers to study the Bible—it never has been enough. When the way is opened for the 'common people', who once heard our Lord gladly, to hear Him again, we shall find that 'the Lord hath more light and truth yet to break forth out of His holy word.'

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Asking in Christ's Name

By the Reverend John G. Williams, M.A., Liverpool

I imagine you would be rather startled if I told you I knew a burglar who, every time he was just setting off on a fresh burgling expedition, always kneels down and says a prayer asking God to bless and prosper his enterprises! Well, you needn't be alarmed, because I don't happen to know of any burglar who does that; though I have come across lots of people who do things rather like it. There is a passage in the Memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini, the famous Italian sculptor and silversmith of the Renaissance, where he tells of a bloodthirsty quarrel with one of his many enemies. They had got involved in a murderous duel in the streets of Rome and Cellini was thrown into prison. There, he tells us, he knelt down on the stone floor of his cell and prayed 'O God, help me to get my revenge on this foul dog, my enemy.' Well, that sounds a good deal like my imaginary burglar. I wonder if Cellini seriously believed that God—the loving Father whom Jesus came to show us—would actually help and bless his revenge. It was a strange idea of God he must have had.

Of course we must make some allowance for the fact that he lived in an age of cruelty and violence; and yet that kind of attitude to God is much more common than we sometimes realize. Perhaps people are not quite so simple about it as they used to be; but there are still many who think that you can pray to God about pretty well anything you like and expect Him to do something about it. I came across a man not long ago who religiously says a

prayer for guidance every time he fills in his Football coupons ! I expect there was a touch of superstition about that, but so there is about a good deal of ' prayer.' An old man once said to me ' I believe in saying a prayer now and then—I reckon it brings you luck ! ' You see the danger of that kind of attitude. If any one regards prayer simply as a kind of magic way of getting things done, just for themselves, then they are bound to be disappointed. We can't use God just as a means of getting the things we want for ourselves. It is the other way round. Prayer is a way of letting God use *us* to do the things *He* wants. It is always ' Thy will be done,' not ' My will be done.' That is one of the hardest lessons to learn about prayer, but till we have learnt it prayer will remain merely superstitious nonsense.

You see, Jesus never said, ' Ask anything you like and you will get it.' He said, ' Whatever you ask *in my name* that will I do.' Now that is a very important difference—' in my name.' What does it mean ? Well, you know how we talk about some one having a good name or a bad name. ' Give a dog a bad name. . . .' You know the old saying. It means a good or a bad reputation ; a good or a bad character. A man's name is what he *is*. So praying for things ' in Christ's name ' means asking for things that are, so to speak, in keeping with Christ's whole character ; the sort of things that I know He would wish, the sort of things that are in line with His will, the sort of things that will make me and my bit of the world what He wants them to be. In other words the sort of things that will please God. So obviously I can't ask God, in the name of Christ, to help me get the better of some one else, for example. I can't ask Him to give me all the comforts and pleasures and successes I would like for myself quite regardless of how they would affect other people if I got them. I can't ask Him to help me make a fortune in the Football Pools any more than I can ask Him to bless a burgling expedition. But I can ask Him to help me to be a bit better-tempered at home, to be a bit more willing to pull my weight and help other people instead of just suiting myself. I can ask for courage to see me through a sticky situation, or for a bit more patience with people who annoy me. I can ask Him to show me the sort of job He wants me to do and to help me to prepare myself for it, remembering that whenever I ask God for anything He will always ask me for something in return—hard work, honesty, courage, patience, perseverance. In fact I can ask God for any mortal thing that I believe will help me to make the best possible job of the things God has put me here in the world to do. But it is God's business I am on—not my own—and once that idea becomes plain I shall see that prayer is the most important way of keeping all the time in touch with God and what He wants. I shall want to thank Him for all the good things of my life. I shall want to ask His forgiveness whenever things go wrong. I shall want to worship Him for all His greatness and wisdom and power. All that is part of prayer too, don't forget. But as far as ' asking ' is concerned (either for myself or for other people) I shall only be able to ask sincerely for the things that I believe are in line with His will and purpose and plan.

The whole thing is perfectly summed up in a very ancient prayer, over five hundred years old, which happens to be the Collect for to-day—the Tenth Sunday after Trinity. It is a prayer that you might like to say at the beginning of all your times of prayer :

' Let thy merciful ears, O Lord, be open to the prayers of thy humble servants ; and that they may obtain their petitions make them to ask such things as shall please thee ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.'

The First Lunar Church

By the Reverend Theo. F. Valentine, Harrow

I read in the *Manchester Guardian* a month or two ago about a priest in charge of a church in Buxton, Derbyshire, who on entering his church one day found a dollar note which had been placed there by some visitor. There were no instructions as to what he should do with this gift. What should he do with it ? What did he do with it ? He wrote off to the Interplanetary Development Corporation in New York and applied for a site on the moon for the building of the first Lunar Christian Church. The newspaper paragraph says he now has the deeds of the land. He was certainly a man with ideas—or shall we say he was far-seeing ? He may have been reading about Dan Dare in *The Eagle* or listening to ' Journey into Space ' on the radio—I don't know ! It is very obvious anyway that he was convinced that Jesus Christ is the light of the world and without Him there would be ' darkness ' even on the moon. We agree that ' Lunar dwellers '—if there are any—need Jesus Christ as much as Earth dwellers !

Of course there are some serious problems ! Can we get there ? Can we stay there if we arrive ? Is there anybody there ; if so, could we understand each other ? What kind of building would the church have to be ? Would it mean going to church in space suits ?

Although it is a good idea to look well ahead, was this dollar note well spent ? Are there not crowds of earth dwellers who have still to be brought within the Church ? At least one third of the world's total population has yet to hear the

name of Jesus and so many more millions to be brought within the Kingdom. Yes, there are vast areas where the 'lunar' problems don't exist—places where we can go and stay, where there are crowds and crowds of people we could understand. There would be no problems over buildings either, and we certainly wouldn't have to be bottled up in space suits. The problem here is the need for people to go and money with which to send them.

If every Christian everywhere gave £1 every year a great many more people could hear the good tidings of Jesus Christ and know the light and joy He brings.

Where do you come in in all this? Well, we cannot send missionaries abroad or even think of building lunar churches without strong sending churches. So you must help to make your church strong and active. You must serve all you can, pray all you can, and give all you can. Perhaps you yourself will one day be sent to tell others of the Jesus you know and love.

The Christian Year

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Doing, not Hearing, the Foundation of Character

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MENZIES, D.D., GLASGOW

'Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. . . . And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand.'—Mt $7^{24. 26}$.

This parable which forms the conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount is really a poem. With its balanced sentences it is one of the best instances in the New Testament of Hebrew parallelism. But, poem though it be, it has a cutting edge to it, containing a solemn warning and a ringing challenge. It is patterned on two contrasts, the contrast between two builders, two houses, two foundations, and two final results. And what is the main burden of our Lord's concern in this parable? It is quite definitely the whole problem of character-building. It is human life of which He is thinking, and the condition on which strong, stable, and dependable character can be built.

The first point He makes is that we are all *engaged in building* the house of life. This is not a matter of choice but of necessity. This necessity is inherent in the nature of things. Whether we like it or not this is the basic condition on which we hold our tenure of life. Every act we perform, every impulse on which we proceed, every decision we make are all adding their quota to the structure of character. We may make inferior choices, act on evil impulses, pursue dubious courses, but they all go to make us what we are. On the other hand we may take the opposite course and build truly and well, in which case we succeed in making a good character. In either case we cannot evade the necessity of building.

The second point Jesus makes is that for character-building the most important thing is *the foundation*. No man ever built a house in the air. He must have ground on which to site it. And the selection of a site is a matter of fundamental importance. There were two builders in this parable who were faced with this problem, and roughly they represent the human race. The one chose a good site, the other a bad. The one built on rock, the other on sand. What is the idea underlying these metaphors? By these our Lord means us to understand that there are two contrasted ways of setting about the high enterprise of character-building. We can build our lives on the rock of unshakeable moral and spiritual conviction, or on the shifting sands of expediency. The first man took the long view, looked ahead, assessed justly the stresses to which his house must inevitably be subjected in the near future. So he dug deep till he struck the rock, something solid and unyielding. The other took just the opposite course. He was a speculative builder in the strict sense of the term. He never looked ahead. He never anticipated trouble. He selected the first site that met his eye. He had no ground-plan governing his choice. He lived for the moment, followed his capricious inclinations, yielded to the conventions of society, was the victim of his transitory desires and whims. In all his decisions and actions there was nothing solid and substantial on which to sustain the superstructure of character. And the verdict of Jesus was, not that the one man was good and the other bad, but that the one was profoundly wise and the other inconceivably stupid.

The third point Jesus makes is that it is necessary to know what a right foundation is. He is not content with stating general principles, but comes down to particulars. He states specifically what He has in mind. The rock foundation on which to build is prompt and implicit *obedience* to His declared teachings. He has made these teachings unambiguously plain in the Sermon He has just preached. He has laid bare there the principles on which strong, reliant character must be built. He has unfolded to men the true pattern of life, the way they should behave towards God and men, the kind of mind and spirit they should exhibit. 'Obey My teachings,' said Jesus, 'practise what I have preached, and you will build on rock.' Notice carefully the distinction He draws. It is not a distinction between those who hear

His words and those who do not hear, but between those who hear and act and those who hear and fail to act. Jesus claimed that the difference between these two reactions represents the difference between building on rock or sand. The two contrasted types literally represent the difference between survival and destruction.

In passing, let us pause for a moment to assess what is involved in this claim. Has anyone before or since ever dared to say that obedience or disobedience to His revealed word are matters of life or death? The underlying assumption is that His statement of truth corresponds with the nature of divine reality. His teachings are the ground plan of human existence. His revealed will represents the moral order of the world. He is appropriating to Himself the ancient promise, 'Behold I lay in Zion . . . a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation.' Jesus here is virtually putting Himself forward as the Master of life, whose teachings must be obeyed if we are not to make of our lives a ruin. This raises the whole problem of our Lord's spiritual authority. It is sometimes said that there is no theology in the Sermon on the Mount. But if this is not theology one would like to know what is.

The fourth point Jesus makes is that *foundations are vital* in view of the inevitable tensions to which the house of life must sooner or later be subjected. Impacted sand is as solid a foundation as rock so long as the skies above are blue. But a day comes when the barometer falls and the rains descend and the floods come. When that happens foundations are the only things that matter.

Had Jesus in His mind the siftings of the final Judgment Seat when every man's work would be tried of what worth it is? That may have been, but not necessarily so. Life itself is a sufficiently trying ordeal to warrant these grave words of warning. Sooner or later the winds of adversity batter us. The dreary, drenching rain of sickness, ill-health and depression gets us down. The floods of disaster, calamity or bereavement overwhelm us. If we are to survive that ordeal successfully we must have solid and deep foundations on which to rest. We must be rooted and grounded in Christ, the Rock of ages. The only way to do that is that we should every day and every hour be practising the precepts of Christ, and rendering implicit obedience to His revealed will.

Finally it should be observed that the words of our text form *a conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount.* Jesus was much too practised a preacher to leave His words hanging in the air. He was deeply conscious of the great gulf fixed between merely hearing and obeying, between listening to a sermon and building it into a life. So His final appeal is addressed to what Oliver Wendell Holmes calls 'the autocrat on the throne of personality,' the will.

One often wonders about the fate of sermons. The preacher preaches, the congregation listens closely or perfunctorily, then they disperse. The subsequent comments are varied. A dull sermon, an interesting sermon, or that most obnoxious comment of all, 'a finished production.' Has it never occurred to the hearer that no sermon is ever finished till it is finished in the will to act? A lady said recently to me 'I have only one test of a good sermon: *not*, does it stir my feelings, inform my mind, or enliven my imagination, but simply this, Does it send me away resolved to live a better life?' How right she was. Sometimes well-meaning and kindly people come to the preacher at the close of a service and say to him: 'That was a most inspiring message you gave us to-day.' Or, 'I enjoyed your sermon immensely.' How many of us have the courage to say 'Well, if that is so, what do you propose to do about it?' That is what Jesus would have said. That, in fact, is what He did say to His hearers at the conclusion of the greatest sermon that ever fell from the lips of man.

'Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. . . . And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them *not*, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house on the sand.'

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Attainment of Wisdom

BY THE VERY REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW

'And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely.'—Lk 16^8.

Life teems with examples of great gifts perverted to base uses. In this shady story of a cunning trickster we have a significant case. In his private life there had been an insidious degeneration. (A man does not lose his soul in a day.) But the time of public exposure is at hand. By a shrewd stratagem he arranges that when he is dismissed from his office he will have the backing of several people he has put in his debt. It is interesting to note that even the master whom he had made his victim could not withhold his admiration from his servant's astuteness. 'The lord *commended* the unjust steward.' It is vastly more important to hear the comment of our Lord Himself. 'I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.'

In other words, the qualities that one man debases, another man may sublimate. Let us see this truth working out in several aspects of this parable.

To begin with, *here was a man who could seize priceless opportunities.* He devised a clever stratagem and was swift to act upon it. Here is one of this dubious character's qualities which he put to ignoble uses, which we can turn to spiritual gain.

For obvious reasons, we ministers of religion know little or nothing of what goes on in the Stock Exchange, but we know 'there is a time to buy and a time to sell.' And by the same token, the Christian learns the spiritual strategy of seizing life's passing opportunities. Take as one example the sphere of temptation. Here he learns the significance of the words spoken of our Lord Himself. 'The devil departed from Him *for a season*.' That is to say, there are priceless intervals in the life of all of us when temptation is quiescent. Bunyan tells us that Giant Despair 'in sunshiny weather, fell into fits'—a circumstance of which his prisoners took full advantage. So in life, even the Devil takes a holiday now and then and these are the seasons when we can be consolidating our position for his inevitable counter-attack. In the warfare between the flesh and the spirit, to which every Christian is conscript, these intervening seasons are invaluable.

Again, to the heart that is ready to exploit them every day brings *priceless opportunities of service.* Wordsworth speaks feelingly of

> that best portion of a good man's life
> His little, nameless, unremembered, acts
> Of kindness and of love.

The best Christians one has known are those whose lives are full of small services, little courtesies, kindly gestures of encouragement on life's hard way. Sir Walter Scott once gathered his family around him when he thought he was dying and said to them 'For myself, my dears, I am unconscious of ever having done any man any injury *or omitted any fair opportunity of doing any man a benefit.*' He could say this with utter truth. May we be able to bear the same testimony.

Again, the unjust steward had *the gift of wisely looking ahead.* He laid his plans so well that when the crisis came he would be able to face it.

If there is one sphere in which such a gift can be precious to us it is, once again, in that of temptation. How differently most of us would act if we remembered that some day a deed of ours would become a memory with which we would have to live and that memory can be either a blessing or a curse. Says Robert Louis Stevenson, 'Sooner or later we all sit down to a banquet of consequences.' And Kipling has three grim lines to the same effect—

> I've taken my fun where I've found it,
> An' now I must pay for my fun.
> . . . . .
> An' the end of it's sittin' and thinkin'—

brooding over the way sin has duped us, thinking of the way it breaks down the altars of trust we have built up in the hearts of those who love us. It is wise to clear a space at times and know that in the economy of God there is no escaping such moral bankruptcy. The trouble is that in the heat of temptation the Tempter makes us blind to the future so that 'we cannot see afar off.'

But thank God there is a happier alternative. It is to anticipate the sweets of victory. How significant are these words spoken of our Lord when He passed through His sore and subtle temptations to splendid victory. 'Angels came and ministered to Him.' We, too, can have these angelic visitations as the glowing aftermath of our temptations —God's 'well done' sounding in our ears, and our troth maintained with those who believe in us.

Finally, even this utterly self-centred man discovered that *one of life's deepest needs is the need of friends.* It is second only to our need of God. True, he had to buy his friends whereas the Christian makes his friends simply by being friendly. This egotist imagined that he could lay out his career in selfish isolation from his fellows. He discovered as we all do that such aloofness is impossible. I read lately of a strange gesture of a magistrate in an English court of law. He had before him two quarrelling women, convicted of a breach of the peace. He bound them over by making them take an oath that they would not speak to one another for six months. I wonder how long the inhuman pact really lasted. Surely the day would come when some trifling need would bring them together. Surely one of them might need a postage stamp or the other would run out of a little sugar! Human nature would break down under the strain. Be that as it may, there will ever be a wide gulf fixed between the isolation of a selfish life and the warm glow that lights up a human heart after some simple deed of helpfulness. To mark the difference, here are two epitaphs that speak for themselves. They are written concerning two kings. In a dry passage in Chronicles we read that Jehoram 'reigned in Jerusalem eight years, and departed without being desired'—or as Moffatt translates it—'with no one to regret him.' The creature passed on and was never missed. On the other hand, listen to the final sentence in that thrilling volume, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, words spoken of the Patriot Prince, William of Orange—'As long as he lived, he was the guiding-star of a brave nation, and when he died the little children cried in the streets.'

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Sympathy

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., EDINBURGH

'I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days.'—Ezk 3^{15}.

Here is a text with a message far different from that which we normally associate with the idea of sympathy. Ezekiel was a sort of chaplain to his own people in exile, commissioned by a great vision which came to him, and sent forth in obedience to that vision to act as the messenger of God. His whole attitude, and most of all his approach to his task have much to teach us whenever any one of us is called of God to be His messenger to any other human soul in need.

First, here are some general qualifications for the messenger. He must be in sympathetic accord with the purpose of Him who sends him and in sympathetic contact with the needs of those to whom he is sent. This whole chapter conveys the impression of a man under orders. It is full of imperatives: 'go,' 'speak,' 'say.' Ezekiel goes not because he chooses, not because he is 'interested in the exiles,' but because he is under orders from God. We are prone to sing with great heartiness the hymns which develop the military metaphors that are part of our faith; do we not often need to stop and remember that if we are in any sense Christian soldiers then we are men under orders? The messenger is a man under orders, whether he conducts a funeral service in church in circumstances of great poignancy, or is a lay visitor going from house to house in a Visitation Campaign, whether he enters the sick-room of a patient whose days are numbered, or tries to offer comfort where words seem strangely futile.

What is more, the messenger must share the sense of urgency with which God sends him forth. A verse or two further on Ezekiel is described as a watchman sent to give warning. The railway bridge is down, its trestles swept away in the boiling flood. Here is a girl running along the track in the path of the oncoming train, stumbling, getting up again, falling for sheer exhaustion, but struggling on, driven by one consideration, that she must get there in time to warn the driver and prevent disaster. There must be that same urgency about God's messenger. Are we in sympathy with the urgency of Him who sends us?

And what use is any message unless it makes sympathetic contact with those to whom we speak? The messenger must speak the language of the hearer, talk in terms he understands. It is a very interesting point that the man whom God sent to the Jews of the Captivity was not a man of Babylon, trained to speak their language, he was one of themselves. He not only spoke their language, he thought in it, too. Billy Graham tells the story of a friend in the States who went to preach at a College Chapel. He went by air, and there was thick fog in the town when the plane arrived overhead. 'There the congregation were,' said Dr. Graham, 'down in the church waiting for a message, and there was the preacher, up in the fog over their heads, circling round and round, quite unable to get down.' What a challenge to the professional 'messenger' to learn the thought-language and the heart-language of his hearers, whoever they may be! What a challenge to the layman, to young folk in all walks of life, to men and women in business, at the bench or loom, at the office desk, to the busy housewife, to put the message into the language of thought and understanding, which is our own already.

Ezekiel's peculiar approach to his task affords a searching reminder that there is only one way of arriving at a sympathetic understanding of the situation, the needs, the difficulties of those to whom we bring any message. He sat where they sat for seven days, just sharing their lot, getting inside the situation, coming to know what it is like to be an exile in a captivity which has gone on far too long. When a man has done that, and only then, he has acquired two further qualifications necessary in a messenger of God.

He can now translate his message in terms of a new understanding. He has removed or disarmed the objection which must often arise in the minds, if not to the lips, of many to whom we dare to speak in God's name: 'You don't even begin to understand the situation I am in.' There are a number of fine men now in the ministry of all the churches who came in as a result of their experiences in the War. Some have no University Degree, but they possess instead the priceless qualification of having known ordinary work-a-day life from the inside. How often that understanding is lacking and mars the true sympathy of our message, be it public, or private, and personal. Not many of us know what it is like to be constantly with a crowd who are clever, cynical, and sneering about the things of the spirit. Not many have any inside knowledge of the lives of those who have no time for religion, to whom it is completely irrelevant and unimportant. Still fewer ever stop to ask why it should be so with so many.

The other objection which it is even more important to remove arises out of the danger of becoming, very subtly and quite without meaning it, a shade condescending and even patronizing in the message we give and the help we offer. It is as if we said, in effect: 'Were I in your place.' We never have any right to say that till we have deliberately tried to put ourselves in the place of

that other person. Really helpful sympathy begins with asking: 'If I had only enough for the bare necessities; if I had never heard the story of Jesus Christ; if I were lying there and knew I had only six months to live: if I had just lost some one dearer than all beside to me.' It was said of the Bishop in *Les Miserables* that 'he understood how to sit down and hold his peace for long hours beside the man who had lost the wife of his love, or the mother who had lost her child. As he knew the moment for silence, he knew also the moment for speech.'

There is also in this incident a challenge to sympathetic treatment of those whom we dislike or of whom we disapprove, or whom we find it hard to understand. Ezekiel says that he went 'in bitterness and heat of spirit.' He had no sympathy with these exiles, and no real heart for serving them. When he had sat long enough where they sat the bitterness dissolved, and his attitude changed. How good if our attitude could change to the people who stand for something of which we disapprove as much as Ezekiel did of the exiles' conduct. How good for us, and them, if we would make a deliberate effort, in Christian love, to understand some of the difficult people with whom we associate perforce from day to day. We have a great example to keep us at our task, the example of Him who for eighteen years after His first commissioning, sat where common folk sat in a country town, shared all they had to bear, handled this poor stuff of human nature with such untiring patience and such staggering respect, who went on loving it unto the end, and died, praying for those who must have been most difficult of all to understand: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Three Human Needs

BY THE REVEREND RODERIC DUNKERLEY, B.A., PH.D., KELVEDON, ESSEX

'The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.'—2 Ti 4^{13}.

Three basic needs of men are suggested by these words. Paul felt them, and so do we all. We may find interesting guidance regarding them if we ponder this text carefully.

1. There is, first of all, the need of the body. In Paul's case it was for warmth—the winter was coming on (see *v.* 21). In prison and unable to take exercise, he needed extra clothing. This reminds us of all the bodily needs which we all share. Our bodies must be cared for and catered for—with food and shelter and clothing.

We ought surely to be very grateful for the multitudes of blessings we all possess in these respects. But we ought not to allow these bodily requirements to have too big a place in our lives. Most of us detest gluttony, over-eating and drinking. But ought we not equally to be careful about over-spending on clothes and adornments? Jesus was very outspoken about not being too concerned about raiment (Mt 6^{28}), and John said, 'He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none' (Lk 3^{11}). How far in modern life such teaching is to be taken literally is of course a difficult question, but it should certainly not just be ignored. We should seek to understand the spirit of it and to apply this to our own circumstances. There is certainly a great deal of lavish expenditure on such things nowadays, which is really a form of selfishness and more akin to paganism than to Christianity.

Especially is this to be deplored in view of the need of so many for the very elementary necessities of life. There are still people living on the border line in our own land, while abroad the millions of displaced persons and refugees are without what most of us would regard as the minimum of clothing and food. It would be a very healthy discipline for some Church members to do without that new coat or suit they are planning to buy and give the money to one of the many associations badly needing funds. Anyhow, whether that is the way for us or not, we should surely avoid the twin dangers of indulgence and indifference. Another word of Paul's comes to mind: 'Having food and raiment let us be therewith content' (1 Ti 6^{8}).

2. But, of course, we have intellectual as well as physical needs. We have minds as well as bodies, and 'man shall not live by bread alone' (Mt 4^{4}). Paul wanted not only his cloak for warmth, he wanted his books that they might give him food for thought. We cannot be certain what these books and parchments were—various explanations have been given; probably the books were the scrolls of Old Testament books, the Psalms for example, and the Prophets, while the parchments were the smaller documents containing some of the sayings of Jesus and stories about Him (for the Gospels were not yet written), and perhaps also some letters from friends or even blank sheets on which he himself might correspond with them or with the churches, the care of which was constantly upon him (2 Co 11^{28}).

We should thank God for books and for the ability to read them. 'Was it worth it?' an old African woman of sixty was asked just after she had learned to read. 'Why, yes, sir,' she said, 'to read for myself that "*God is love*" made all the work worth while.'

With gratitude for books there must also go a warning. We should use well this privilege of reading. Jesus said, 'Take heed what ye hear'

(Mk 4^{24}), and I am sure He would approve the corollary, 'Take heed what ye read.' Some people read little or nothing—perhaps the papers, including all the trivialities of the Sunday press and the weekly magazines. They are starving themselves of the food their minds need if they are to grow and mature. Others read much but with very little relevance to the real needs of their minds and souls. Their lives are perhaps narrow, and their interests parochial—their minds need broadening and deepening, but they are not using this great opportunity of reading to gain this wider experience and finer understanding of the world and the meaning of life. After all, as John Ruskin said, 'If you read this book you can't read that.' There is only a limited time at our disposal for this business of reading, and it is surely important that we choose well how we spend it and what we read.

And there is one other thought. In the familiar collect we are bidden to 'read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest' the Scriptures. These are four good counsels, and they apply to other reading as well as to the Bible. Some merely ephemeral reading is of course inevitable, but good books should be read and studied and read again, until their message becomes part and parcel of us. Far better to read such books three or four times than to read three or four or more slim, slight things of the here-to-day-and-gone-to-morrow type. Naturally the Bible should have first place in our list of such digested and assimilated works, but we should all have others which we so cherish and return to again and again; the *Imitation of Christ* stands high on my list, but there are many others. Some one once said, 'When I see the hosts of new books, I turn again to some of the old friends.'

What is true for us is surely true for others too. What a privilege we should deem it to try and enable those who cannot read to do so—or those who have no books to obtain them. To send a cheque to a Bible Society or similar body may be the best form of thanksgiving for the immeasurable blessings of reading.

3. Finally, Paul needed friendship. He speaks in this verse of Timothy coming to him, and twice he urges him to do so quickly (*vv.* 9, 21). He badly needed his companionship; some of his friends had left him, some were busy elsewhere, one was ill. Man is a social being, needing the association with and the assistance of others, and desiring to share with others the good things of life and faith. Do we not all know the deep satisfaction of feeling that another knows and understands and cares? If we do not, we should consider why our friendships are not of the deep real kind, and we should cultivate more earnestly this side of life. We should thank God for friendship, and strive to make friends, to keep and cherish friendships, and to share the joys of loyal love. It is one of God's best gifts.

But, of course, there are limits to human friendship. So Paul rejoiced that when 'no man stood with me, but all men forsook me,' nevertheless 'the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me' (*vv.* 16 17). Our deepest need of all is for the Divine friendship, the presence of the Unseen Companion. Gilbert Murray has said, 'I find that I cannot, except for a moment and by an effort, refrain from making the assumption that there is a friend behind phenomena,' and the late Bishop of Truro put it more spiritually if less philosophically, 'We never know the full power of Religion until we find it as a great Friendship.' Or more simply still,

What a Friend we have in Jesus,
All our sins and griefs to bear!
What a privilege to carry
Everything to God in prayer!

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Evangelism

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., PINNER

'And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.'—Mt $4^{18.\ 19}$.

1. It is important that we should take this word of Christ in its entirety. Too often we quote the words 'Follow me' and stop there. Or, even more damaging, we add a second phrase to them which bears no relationship to the word of Christ at all. We say, 'Follow Christ, and you will never have a nervous breakdown.' We say, 'Follow Christ, and you will receive strength to resist your temptations.' We say, 'Follow Christ, and you will save your soul.' Christ has often been preached in these terms. Why not?

Because Christianity cannot be an end in itself for any man. If the power of Christ enters my life and stops there, Christ is made the ally of my inveterate self-centredness. Jesus does not say, 'Follow me, and I will cure your nerves, conquer your temptations, and save your soul.' He says, 'Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.' The power of Christ only works in me when it works through me. Christ only steadies my nerves, unifies my will, and glorifies my life, when I am in fact looking beyond myself to the salvation of mankind.

These men did not truly experience the power of Christ that day in Galilee when they left their nets. They began to experience it when they discovered that 'the devils are subject unto us.' They experienced it fully on the day of Pentecost when the power of Christ flowed through them for the conversion of the multitude. And this is the ultimate

meaning of the abused word 'apostolic.' The apostolic Church is the Church through whom the power of Christ is flowing into the world. Apostolic Christianity is the Christianity of those souls whose aim is that Christ should be known and glorified in every human life.

The failure of the Church, in all its forms, in our time is an elementary one. It was summed up wittily some years ago by the old minister who confessed, 'Christ called me to be a fisher of men, but my congregations have always wanted me to be the keeper of an aquarium.' And congregations think like that—think in terms of their own interests and desires—because they do not individually accept the call of Christ to be fishers of men.

Twenty years ago I went to a new dentist. Within ten minutes of my imprisonment in his chair he said, 'Are you interested in Christian Science?' In that most unpropitious environment he steadily witnessed to the non-existence of pain. Five years later I went to a new dentist. Within ten minutes he said, 'Are you interested in the Oxford Group Movement?' Later on that second dentist told me that he had for years been a member of a church, 'but no one,' he said, 'ever told me that it was my first duty as a Christian to make Christians.'

We have no answer to that indictment. It is true—and it expresses quite simply the failure of the Church to-day. We have not put first things first. We have not experienced the power of Christ within us because we have not zealously sought that it should flow beyond us. We have short-circuited Christ. 'Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.'

2. Although I received five years of Christian Science propaganda I am not a Christian Scientist. Although I was exposed to ten years of Oxford Group propaganda I am not a Buchmanite. And we could all point to very zealous and orthodox Christians who have sought to declare Christ in season and out of season, and who seem always to fail to win converts. So we must realize that personal zeal is not by itself enough for the task of evangelism. What else is required?

'I will make you' is His promise. It is no use becoming more zealous if in the process we become more rigid, more censorious, less understanding and less Christian. Christian evangelism must be a manifestation of the spirit of Christ. This also would seem to be a truism and yet how necessary it is in the present situation. Perhaps we may legitimately follow our Lord's metaphor and say that fishing is a great and difficult art, calling for great skill, and that some would-be evangelists thrash the water and scare the fish.

I once knew a most earnest lay preacher who was deeply distressed by his failure to convert any one. For a time he had a Sunday school class of nine boys, and then the reason for his failure emerged. He couldn't mark the register correctly because he didn't know one boy from another. That's not a failure of knowledge, but a failure of love. When Jesus passed through Jericho He said, 'Zaccheus, make haste, and come down.' He knew him: He knew his name. He was not saving souls (in our bad, modern, impersonal use of that word), He was saving men. We fail often because we are not sufficiently zealous, but we fail still more often because we do not possess the compassion of Christ.

The good fisherman breaks his net because he must fish deep. He must drag his net through the sludge and rocks and detritus of the sea bed where the fish are to be found. The good missionary, the good evangelist, breaks his heart, because he enters deeply into the sins and the sorrows of those whom he would win for Christ. We have divorced evangelism in the modern Church from the pastoral work of the Church, and yet it is just there, in the personal sharing of pain, of guilt, of loneliness and of fear, that the power of Christ most naturally flows from us into the lives of others. 'I will make you.' The more Christlike, the more compassionate; the more compassionate, the more evangelical.

3. Evangelism should be personal but not individual. Some years ago I heard an old fisherman preach from this text. He told us that he had a net which had first belonged to his grandfather. Not a thread of that original net remained, because first his grandfather, and then his father, and then he himself had mended it innumerable times. It was quite different, and yet it was the same net. And he ended with great simplicity, 'the Church is Christ's net.'

Simon and Andrew and James and John at the first—cast by Christ into the world to catch men for the Kingdom. You and I to-day cast by Christ into the world. We hear so much about the gulf between the Church and the world, but that is only because we confuse Church with buildings, with liturgy, with clergy. The Church in its true character—the men called by Christ—is everywhere in contact with the world, in shops and factories and offices and homes and schools and colleges. Everywhere Christ comes through His apostles. The meeting together of the Church on Sunday should be the drawing in of the net. From the world of Monday to Saturday affairs we should each bring some one within sound of the gospel. I save no one. I make no one a Christian. But Christ can use me to draw some one whom I know and love within the circle of His saving grace.

The religious revival for which we pray is not far off. It awaits our simple obedience to one of the simplest words of Christ. 'Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.'

Bultmann and the Liberal Theology—II

By the Reverend Geraint Vaughan Jones, M.A., B.Litt., Glasgow

I

If Liberalism means freedom from commitment to doctrinal orthodoxy, to question the traditional view of the Scriptures and to reinterpret their contents, then Bultmann should be considered a Liberal; and if his Liberalism takes the form of drastically rejecting all that is not in conformity with 'modern' knowledge and the right to interpret the Christian faith in terms of the most 'modern' thought, the term Modernist can be applied to him still more appropriately. Not only is his critical attitude towards Biblical historicity of the same character as that of Continental scholars such as Loisy and British Liberal-Modernists such as Kirsopp Lake, E. W. Barnes, H. D. A. Major, and a large number of others whose views about the word and doctrine of Scripture and of orthodox theology are radical, and often negatively so; his aim is similar, namely, to offer a kind of restatement of faith in terms of 'modern' thought. For the sake of convenience the terms 'Liberal,' 'Modernist,' and 'Liberal-Modernist' will be used in this connexion without fine discrimination: the differences between them are of degree, not of principle; and if a term differentiating Bultmann's theology from what is usually known as Modernism is required, one such as the 'New Modernism' (which an American critic of the dialectical theology, Cornelius van Til, has surprisingly applied to the theology of Barth and Brunner), might be employed; and if one type of Modernism, as defined by Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson, was 'essentially the separation of Jesus from Christianity,'[1] Bultmann's version of it might not unfairly be stated to be the separation of the 'historical' Jesus from Christianity. Protestant Modernism, in Rawlinson's view, 'claiming to recover and affirm the religion of Jesus, discards Christianity,' while Bultmann, on the other hand, discards the 'historical' Jesus and retains the 'Christ-event' as the kerygmatic essence of the faith.

The aim of theological Liberalism was admirably stated by the Swiss Professor, H. F. A. Amiel, more than a century ago: 'To transform our Protestantism which is no longer in accord with our life and with science: such is its purpose. It is only by means of education and by what is central to it, namely, philosophy and theology, that this result will be possible. . . For our century what is required is a new dogmatics, that is to say, a more profound explanation of the nature of Christ and of the flashes which it projects on to both heaven and mankind.'[2]

This, to state it thus in general terms, is the purpose of Liberalism and Modernism: the restatement of the Christian faith in terms consistent with the requirements of new generations. The following definitions of Modernism, which apply also to Liberalism, might also be quoted:

'By a Modernist I mean a churchman, of any sort, who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity.'[3]

'The chief justification of Modernism . . . is not that we may water down the gospel but that we may make it more effective, that men may be able to say once again, by the power of the spirit: "We do hear in our own tongues the wonderful works of God."'[4]

'Modernism may be described as the shape which religion takes in the mind of a modern as distinct from a mediæval man.'[5]

It is the 'joyful recognition of modern ideals of culture, the determined application of the historico-critical method to the whole sphere of Biblical research, dogma, and church history; the sharp distinction between religion and theology; the insistence on complete personal freedom in matters of religion.'[6]

Modernism may be regarded as left-wing Liberalism.

In Brunner's view 'Liberalism represents the view that Jesus is not the Christ, the Son of God, nor is He the Saviour of the world; He is merely one outstanding religious personality among others. . . . Theological Liberalism is an arrogant attempt to see "Jesus Himself" without being led to this view by the Apostles'[7]; and in the opinion of A. G. Hebert it goes back to the Enlightenment and attempts 'a synthesis of a modified Christian belief and of Christian moral standards with an anthropocentric attitude of mind,' and interprets the Christian tradition in evolutionary, immanentist, and Pelagian terms[8]; while Dr. L. S.

[1] *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, 6.

[2] *Fragments d'un Journal Intime* [9], i. 7, 11.

[3] G. Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-roads*, 5.

[4] W. R. Matthews, in *The Modern Churchman* [October, 1927], p. 256.

[5] A. Houtin, *Modernisme Catholique*, 195.

[6] J. Schnitzer, *Der Katholische Modernismus*, 4

[7] *Dogmatics*, ii. 240, 252.

[8] *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 109.

Thornton describes it as simply the theological counterpart of that secular humanism which is still the tortured soul of our modern world, and considers the system of theology which went by its name to have been completed half a century ago and now lies in ruins.[1] It was a compromise between traditional Christianity and modern philosophy, and attempted to distinguish between the kernel and the husk, fondly imagining that the ancient speech could give way to modern idiom. A French exponent of 'Liberal Christianity,' Jean Réville, held that Liberalism endeavoured to establish a Christianity which was independent of local and temporary forms and which should be regarded ('as preached by Jesus') as 'simply religion and ethics indissolubly united in the depths of the human conscience,'[2] and stood for 'the supremacy of reason and conscience in religious matters as in all other departments of the spiritual life.' Réville believed that Liberalism was a continuation of the principles of the Reformation, and should not be accused of being a 'reduced Christianity,' because it stands foursquare on the teaching of Jesus, not on what was said by people who had neither seen Jesus nor heard what He said. 'Experience' is given a prominent position in the liberal understanding of Christianity according to Réville.

One aim of Liberalism was to show that there was no fundamental incompatibility between religion and science, and between Christianity and 'modern thought,' if only the 'essentials' of the former could be separated from the contingent and from those Biblical elements which belonged to the antique view of Nature and personality. Hence the tendency of nineteenth-century Liberalism to present the 'historical' Jesus in a manner acceptable to the man of the time. It should be stated that Schweitzer's Christology, despite his repudiation of the liberal 'lives' of Jesus, was no less radical than theirs. Although 'Liberalism' is represented, for the anti-liberal theologians, chiefly by Harnack and Troeltsch, it should be pointed out that many of the most distinguished British theologians and Biblical scholars openly described themselves as Liberal or Modernist.[3] The term should not be regarded as applying only to Continental liberal Protestantism. Further, it is necessary to state that many of the judgments on the liberal theology have been directed against a caricature of this theology, and it is time that this should be recognized, as has been done recently by Professor E. P. Dickie, whose fair and appreciative evaluation of Liberalism is a welcome change from the one-sided and usually extravagantly unjust criticisms which have become fashionable in recent years.[4]

Doctrinally Liberalism emphasized the humanity of Jesus and discouraged metaphysical speculation about His Person; Incarnation was thought of as a form of 'immanence' (for which Scriptural support is by no means lacking) and as the revelation that in Jesus is seen 'perfectly exemplified the Kinship of God and Man.' the 'consummation of the Divine Indwelling in mankind.'[5] The Liberals denied, generally, the Virgin Birth as doctrinally unnecessary and for critical reasons improbable. The Creeds they considered to be obsolete statements inconsistent with 'modern' thinking and the results of a no longer valid philosophy. Miracles and the orthodox-evangelical ideas of the Atonement they likewise rejected. If Liberalism has been reproached with dissolving Christianity into timeless and universal truths,[6] it could be replied that any truth should be timeless and universally valid if it is to be accepted as true at all. It goes without saying that the liberal theologians believed in the thoroughgoing application of criticism to doctrine and to the Bible.

II

From the foregoing some indication is apparent of the negative and positive relation in which Bultmann stands to the liberal theology. The challenge of 'Modernism,' or rather modernity, to Biblical Christianity, in his view, is expressed in two ways: firstly, in the dissolution of the cosmology of antiquity and the New Testament view of Nature in the modern world-view. The 'kerygma,' in its New Testament form, is simply unacceptable to modern man because in it is implicated a pre-scientific cosmology. Science and technology have so changed our view of the world that the New Testament cannot be accepted as it formerly was. We no longer believe in a vertical 'Ascension,' a descent into hell, in good and evil spirits, and the miraculous. To this picture of the modern challenge the liberal theology would give its support; indeed, liberal theologians were saying these things long before Bultmann wrote his essay on demythologizing, which hardly came as a shock to those who had not abandoned their liberal theology. The second challenge to orthodoxy comes, says Bultmann, from 'modern' man's understanding of himself, which is based on an anthropology and psychology quite different from

[1] *Revelation and the Modern World*, 108.

[2] *Liberal Christianity*, 56.

[3] The names of Percy Gardner, William Sanday, W. R. Matthews, Hastings Rashdall, C. E. Raven, B. H. Streeter, Kirsopp Lake, among Anglicans, and Miall Edwards, Nathaniel Micklem, C. J. and A. T. Cadoux, among Nonconformists, might be mentioned.

[4] *God is Light*, 11 ff.

[5] H. D. A. Major, *English Modernism*, 154.

[6] Cf. *Kerygma and Myth*, 13.

those which were presupposed by the Apostolic Age. Hence he finds what the New Testament has to say about 'spirit' 'utterly strange and incomprehensible,' the attribution of human morality to Adam's sin 'sheer nonsense,' and original sin as an inherited infection 'sub-ethical, irrational and absurd.' Moreover, affirmations about Jesus as pre-existent, as being God-Man, are foreign to the intellectual atmosphere in which modern man lives. And finally, the character of New Testament 'mythology' is such that something has to be done about it. What this is requires no elaborate exposition: Bultmann's thesis is sufficiently familiar by now. Whatever the solution to be offered, it is to be attempted for the benefit of the 'modern' man to whom the kerygma is to be made acceptable; and Fritz Buri asks whether, in using an existential instead of an idealistic philosophy, Bultmann is no less dissolving the gospel into a 'general human possibility' than were the Liberals whom he criticizes.[1] We are not questioning the accuracy or adequacy of Bultmann's account of the modern man's mentality nor whether, as Professor de Vos has contended, it is possible or permissible to generalize about 'modern' man in this way[2]; nor are we claiming, with Bultmann, that the use of electric light and modern medical discoveries is not compatible with the co-existence of many non-'modern' attitudes of mind; for contemporary man is capable of capitulating to all manner of superstition and nonsensical political mythology. For Bultmann the typically 'modern' man is to be regarded as he whose thinking is determined by the scientific environment and its presuppositions, and because of this he cannot find room in his scheme for the miraculous and the supernatural.

Here, again, Bultmann is in agreement with the typically Liberal-Modernist point of view: belief in the miraculous is to-day impossible because we recognize that an event in Nature must be understood in terms of natural law and because miracle is an interference with the regularity of Nature[3]; for the notion of uniformity, he says, underlies all our thinking about Nature. The notion of the miraculous as *contra naturam* is unthinkable.[4] The only truly miraculous is revelation, which means the grace of God shown towards the godless.[5] Hence Bultmann rejects as unacceptable the Gospel miracles, particularly those of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection stories in their present form.

[1] *Kerygma und Mythos*, ii. 89.

[2] *Nieuwe Testament en Mythe*, 52 ff.: '*Bultmann en de moderne Mens.*'

[3] *Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 214: '*Zur Frage des Wunders.*'

[4] *Ib.*, 216.

[5] *Ib.*, 221.

The appeal to the uniformity of Nature and to the regularity of natural law was employed in *Essays and Reviews* by Baden Powell, and liberal thought has followed the same lines ever since. Dean Inge describes miracle as 'the bastard child of faith and reason, which child neither can afford to own,' and considered its abandonment to be 'pure gain,'[6] and Sanday was sceptical about its occurrence; he refrained from dogmatism on the matter, though for critical reasons he questioned the authenticity of the Gospel miracles[7]; and other leading Anglican Liberal-Modernists, such as Dr. Percy Gardner, Dr. Bethune-Baker, J. M. Hardwick, and others, had adopted much the same kind of argument in dealing with the question of miracles. Bultmann's views about the Resurrection narrative are scarcely to be distinguished from those of Modernists such as Kirsopp Lake, J. M. Thomson, Bishop Barnes, and C. J. Cadoux. For, as Bultmann says, the miracles of the New Testament have ceased to be miraculous, and to defend their historicity by recourse to nervous disorders 'only serves to underline the fact.'[8]

It is hardly necessary to indicate Bultmann's attitude towards the two foci of traditional Evangelicalism: belief in the absolute authority and inerrancy of Scripture and in the efficacy of the vicarious Atonement. It is enough to say that in this, too, he is in the liberal tradition. Indeed, Bultmann here parts company with the recovered Biblicism of much of contemporary theology and even goes so far as to say that the Old Testament is no longer 'revelation' for the Christian faith and that the history of Israel is not, for us, revelation-history as it is for the Jews, for we do not point back to the Exodus and other 'historical' events celebrated in the Old Testament. The history of the Jewish people is something quite other than God's self-revelation and offer of forgiveness in Christ.[9] The Old Testament is not 'the Word of God in the authentic sense for Christian belief'[10]; and Bultmann's monumental commentary on the Fourth Gospel is among the most radical works of its kind, and in his estimate of Hellenistic and Gnostic influences on the New Testament he stands close to Bousset and the 'religious-historical' school.

Despite his profound evangelical concern, Bultmann will have nothing to do with the Church

[6] *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, 198, 207.

[7] *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*, 101 ff; *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 213; *Divine Overruling*, 65.

[8] *Kerygma and Myth*, 5.

[9] *Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 333: '*die Bedeutung des alten Testaments für den Christlichen Glauben.*'

[10] *Ib.*, 334.

doctrines of the Atonement as the vicarious bearing by Jesus of the sins of the world and expiating them by His blood-sacrifice : a ' mythological interpretation ' which is a ' hotch-potch of sacrificial and juridical analogies which have ceased to be tenable for us to-day.' [1] Thus, like the Liberal-Modernist theologians, he rejects an ' objective ' interpretation of the Atonement, though he does not fail to give evangelical emphasis to the redemptive action of the Cross as that which God has ' set up ' for us. To believe in the Cross means to ' make it our own ' and to participate in it as an ' ever-present reality.'

Now it is true that extreme exponents of Liberal Protestantism would possibly disallow such a degree of evangelical interpretation, though this is not typical of British liberal theology. Hastings Rashdall rejected no less definitely than Bultmann the whole apparatus of orthodox evangelical doctrines of the Atonement, and a Modernist such as Dr. C. J. Cadoux, while rejecting absolutely the kind of interpretation which Bultmann describes as mythological, nevertheless laid a primary emphasis on the centrality of the Cross.[2] The Liberal-Modernist interpretation of the Cross is in its essence hardly to be distinguished from Bultmann's, for its emphasis is on what is done *to* man rather than *for* him : it is efficacious in so far as man adopts a positive, receptive attitude towards it. The Cross is not a transaction between Christ and God but the revelation of His love.[3] For Bultmann it is a permanent factor significant for man's understanding of himself and of faith, not a ' mythological ' event.[4]

Whereas, however, Liberalism was profoundly concerned about Christology, Bultmann appears to be indifferent to it. Faith is not determined by theories of the Person of Jesus, and, in any case, these would be only speculation, for a basis for them is absent. We search Bultmann's writings in vain for any indication of what might be called an ' objective ' Christology in the sense of something which can be predicated of Jesus. ' How far is a Christological statement about Him,' Bultmann asks, ' at the same time one about myself ? ' [5] His own view appears to be that the New Testament affirmations about the Divinity or Godhead of Jesus are not to be taken as ' objective ' statements about His nature but rather about His significance *for us*, and set forth what He is as the One in whom God speaks and deals with us. In any case, ' Jesus Christ as an eschatological event is not to be objectively ascertained,' [6] and it is as an eschatological event that the coming of Jesus is to be interpreted. Beyond this one may not go : how Jesus is the eschatological Word of revelation does not matter and cannot, indeed, be known.

Further, much of contemporary theological polemic is directed against what is called the religion of experience or ' consciousness ' (Schleiermacher),[7] and disparages this factor in the interpretation of faith as detracting from the ' objective ' and ' absolute ' character of revelation. Yet it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Bultmann is quite as culpable of the same offence (if offence it is) as that of which Liberalism is accused ; for there is no *essential* difference between the process of making value judgments and that of making existential judgments. The Cross is efficacious not in itself but in so far as I respond to it and it is addressed to me in my predicament as an individual. ' The saving efficacy of the Cross of Christ,' says Bultmann, ' is not derived from the fact that it is the Cross of Christ : it is the Cross of Christ because it has this saving efficacy,' that is because it evokes my faith, and my faith is my release from the past and my openness to the future.[8] In one way or another Bultmann emphasizes the ' subjective ' factor even though he formally denies its experience, for if the gospel is to be understood in terms of my understanding of myself, this means *in terms of my experience of existence*. Though it may be a different kind of experience from Schleiermacher's ' absolute dependence on God ' or the liberal's personal attitude towards Jesus who evokes his response to the Divine *agape* and offers a moral example, it can be reduced to the same lowest common denominator. It is the kind of philosophy, not the manner of the procedure, which distinguishes Bultmann from the liberals who interpreted theology in the philosophical idiom of their day, just as he employs the philosophical categories of his. Existentialism, Bultmann would claim, is the contemporary modern philosophy, though he has distinguished between ' existential self-understanding ' and the ' existentialist understanding of human existence elaborated by philosophical analysis.' [9]

A further, and important, question, is how far Bultmann's ' existential ' interpretation of the New Testament and his attitude towards history disqualify him from belonging to the liberal tradition.

[1] *Kerygma and Myth*, 35.

[2] *The Message about the Cross*, 37 ff. ; cf. A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking*, 126–161.

[3] J. M. Wilson, *The Gospel of the Atonement* [1900], 125.

[4] *Kerygma and Myth*, 37.

[5] *Glauben und Verstehen*, ii. 252.

[6] *Ib.*, 258.

[7] ' Faith is not a state of consciousness ' (*Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 22).

[8] *Theology of the New Testament*, 319 ff., *Kerygma and Myth*, 19. Cf. *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der Antiken Religionen* [1949], 205 ff.

[9] *Kerygma and Myth*, 203.

Moreover, it can be reasonably contended that Bultmann's 'existential' attitude towards 'history' and the 'historic' is a form of escape from the negative conclusions of his critical method which are only perhaps more negative than those of the Modernist School. Indeed, it would seem that the constructive aspect of his work is designed to overcome the difficulty caused by his conviction that the historical approach to the gospel can provide no real basis for faith. In this, too, his attitude is similar to that of Liberals who, having abandoned myth and miracle and are alive to the effect of Biblical criticism on belief, are driven to find a more 'subjective' and experiential basis for it. The danger lurking in Bultmann's thought is that the historical is of little account and in holding that faith is virtually independent of 'history.' This has led to the kind of apologetic represented by Professor John Knox's *Criticism and Faith*, and to the unhelpful conclusion that it really does not matter if criticism has undermined what used to be regarded as the factual foundation of faith.

Whether demythologizing will prove to be more acceptable to the 'modern' man than what Lionel Thornton has called the 'liberal experiment' remains to be seen; for it would appear that it is not so much the presentation of the gospel as the gospel itself which is foolishness and a stumbling-block, and to reduce it to the summons to self-understanding is no less a 'reduction' of it than the Modernist 'dilution' of it is alleged to be. Both Liberalism and (if I may use the word) Bultmannism appear to the plain man to be forms of theological prevarication, though there may be some, it is hoped, who still believe that if the 'modern' man would have the patience to attend to the liberal interpretation he might be inclined to accept it.

Contributions and Comments

Did Jesus Speak Greek?

In the December issue of The Expository Times (lxvii. 92) the Rev. A. W. Argyle poses the above question and answers it in the affirmative. It is, however, very doubtful whether his argument can bear the weight of his conclusion.

Mr. Argyle says that if Jesus held intercourse with the Greek-speaking Gentiles of Galilee He must have spoken Greek. But these Gentiles would, all of them, be quite as familiar with Aramaic as with Greek, considering that 'so far back as the seventh century B.C. Aramaic was the language of communication for commerce and diplomacy between the nations in Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, and Palestine.'[1] The phrase 'Greek-speaking Gentiles' does not mean that these people spoke only Greek, but that in the midst of a population where the everyday language was Aramaic these Gentiles were bilingual.

Again, 'If Jesus in His teaching alluded to the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. . . . He must have known Greek.' But to accept that as a fact I should require more evidence that our Lord knew the LXX than Mr. Argyle supplies. It is, I believe, agreed that many of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament were made from memory, and it is more than probable that when Matthew wrote 5^{39-40} he put the words of our Lord into a form with which he was quite familiar.

Mr. Argyle does not appear to realize how widespread and popular was the Aramaic language in all that part of the world at least from the fourth century B.C. to the ninth century A.D. It was so widespread and popular that it would cover all the cases which he mentions, such as that of the Syrophenician woman, the members of the Dispersion, the Greeks whom Philip brought to our Lord, and all those people whom Peter addressed on the Day of Pentecost. As Dr. C. C. Torrey says: 'As is now well known, the mother tongue of Jesus of Nazareth, of the Galilean villagers, of the people of Jerusalem and Judaea, in short, of all Palestine, was a fairly homogeneous dialect of Western Aramaic . . . wherever a word or a phrase is quoted in its original form, in the Gospels or the Acts, it is Aramaic. . . . The Hellenist author of the second half of Acts records that the charge given by Jesus to the Apostle to the Gentiles (xxiv. 14–18) was delivered in Aramaic ("the Hebrew language").'[2]

If we admit that Jesus knew and spoke Greek when He was addressing crowds and conversing with His disciples, we must also admit that He spoke in the *Koiné*, *i.e.*, in the everyday Greek 'they could all understand.' This confronts us with a serious problem. If Jesus spoke in the *Koiné*, why have all the Gospel writers quoted Him in a Greek which is certainly not the *Koiné*, a Greek of which we have no record that anyone spoke, and which is a hybrid composed of Greek words and Aramaic syntax?

H. Mudie Draper

East Preston,
West Sussex

[1] Lamsa, *The Four Gospels*, p. xv.

[2] *The Four Gospels*, 250.

Amos vii. 14

'I was [am] no prophet, neither was [am] I a prophet's son' (R.V.)

WITH reference to Professor G. R. Driver's note on Am 7^{14}, I cannot deny his translation of the Hebrew לֹא. But I cannot help asking myself and Dr. Driver 'Is your journey really necessary?' The A.V., R.V., and R.S.V. all take it as meaning what it says literally, 'I am no prophet.' The Septuagint has the past tense *οὐκ ἤμην προφήτης ἐγὼ, οὐδὲ υἱὸς προφήτου, ἀλλ' ἢ αἰπόλος ἤμην.* The tense can be past or present. In as much as it could be past, we could argue that Amos is saying 'I *was* no prophet . . . but I *was* a dresser of sycomore-trees. But to-day I *am* a prophet because the Lord took me from following the flock and the Lord said to me, "Go, prophesy to my people."' This does away with Dr. Driver's opening difficulty that Amos denies that he is a prophet although known by every one to be such. Why should Amos deny this? I agree with Dr. Driver that 'he never said any such thing.' What Amos said was 'I was not a prophet—until recently when the Lord called me.'

Amos means that he had not belonged to a school of prophets and never did so belong. I believe that this is the whole point of the assertion. He is pointing the difference between the professional prophets and himself. The professionals prophesied easy things and led the people astray. (See Hos 4^{4-9}—prophet and priest are under the same condemnation—referring to the same country and the same period.) Amos, because he is no professional prophet, can be forthright, and is so in the next breath (Am 7^{16-17}). Dr. Driver's translation makes Amos the son of a prophet, which is what he most certainly is not. His call is straight from God; it is not hereditary. 'The Lord took me . . . and the Lord said to me. . . .'

Dr. Driver, in order to make his interpretation of the Hebrew לֹא fit into the context translates: 'I not a prophet . . . because I am a pricker and dresser of sycomore-trees! And the Lord has taken me from following the flock. . . .' He explains that the first sentence is a rhetorical question spoken indignantly. I cannot imagine Amos being indignant at a slur on himself; it does not fit the picture that I get of Amos from the rest of his words. Again Dr. Driver has to insert 'because' into his translation as well as into his interpretation. 'In other words, Amos asks: "do you suppose that I am not a true prophet because. . . ."' I wonder how permissible this is. It is not in the Hebrew text.

J. MACCORMACK

Masuku, Choma,
N. Rhodesia

Recent Foreign Theology

International Review of Biblical Studies. Another issue of the invaluable publication which surveys the articles on the Bible and related subjects which have appeared in the world's journals has made its appearance.[1] This is the first half of the volume for 1953–54, and it deals with articles which appeared in three hundred and ninety-three different periodicals, and in most cases it offers a brief summary of the articles. A large and international team of scholars has co-operated in its preparation, and no one who would be abreast of Biblical scholarship can afford to neglect it. It deals with more than fifteen hundred articles, which are classified according to the aspect of Biblical study with which they deal, and there is an author index. No one individual could keep in touch with this vast number of journals, even if they were all available to him, but if he wishes to know what has appeared recently on any subject of interest to him within this field, he will find immense help here. A very great and important service to Biblical scholarship is being rendered by those who prepare this survey, which should be in all good theological libraries and in reference libraries.

[1] *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*, vol. ii., Heft 1–2 [1955]. Patmos Verlag, Düsseldorf; DM 34.

Missions in Theological Education. A very remarkable piece of research has been undertaken by a Norwegian scholar, the firstfruits of which have been published in the first volume of a *magnum opus* on *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*. The work is by Olav G. Myklebust and is written in excellent English, and its sub-title indicates that Alexander Duff's Chair of Evangelistic Theology in Edinburgh figures conspicuously in it.[2] The author surveys the place the missionary function of the

[2] *The Study of Missions in Theological Education: An Historical Inquiry into the Place of World Evangelization in Western Protestant Ministerial Training with particular reference to Alexander Duff's Chair of Evangelistic Theology* (Studies of the Egede Institute, No. 6), [1955]. Egede Instituttet, Oslo.

Church has had in academic study and writing down to the year 1910—and it is to be presumed that he proposes to carry the story down later in the continuation of the work. An enormous amount of research has gone into the compilation of the volume, and the reader will learn a great deal about theological education in many countries, as well as about the particular aspect of that education which forms the focus of the author's interest. Duff's Chair figures so prominently because it was the first Chair of Missions ever to be established—though holders of Chairs with other titles had given attention to the theoretical study of the missionary function of the Church. The reasons for the failure of the Scottish experiment are examined, and the author deplores that there are not Chairs of Missions in the English Universities. In America there are many such Chairs, both in universities and in theological seminaries. It should be remembered, however, that one of the many functions of Duff's Chair was to give some instruction about non-Christian religions, and the subject of Comparative Religion (or the History of Religions) figures in the curriculum of more than one British university. Moreover, the History of Christian Missions is a branch of Ecclesiastical History, and should have some place in the curriculum of that subject. One of the objects of Duff's Chair was 'the securing of a suitable supply of candidates for the foreign field as well as of funds to maintain and extend the work abroad.' This is in no sense a proper object of an academic appointment.

Dr. Myklebust's work should do much to stimulate interest in the inclusion of the subject of Missions in the theological curriculum, though the reviewer—whose interest in missionary work is, he believes, above suspicion—is doubtful if that is to be secured by Chairs of 'Missions.' He finds it hard to see how any one can teach the Old or New Testament without treating of the Biblical foundations of missionary work, or how any one can lecture on the History of the Church in the nineteenth century without dealing with the missionary movement, while non-Christian religions are best studied in universities as an academic, and not as a propagandist, subject. This does not lessen the reviewer's gratitude for an immensely interesting and valuable book, which is itself a first-class historical study.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

Entre Nous

George Herbert

The Student Christian Movement is rendering the Church a signal service by publishing in neat and attractive volumes some of the outstanding classics of devotional and pastoral literature. The title of the series is 'A Treasury of Christian Books,' and in the volumes already issued the names of John Wesley, John Bunyan, Brother Lawrence, and St. Francis are represented. The latest publication is *The Country Parson and Selected Poems*, by George Herbert (8s. 6d. net). Though it may not be so well known as some others in the series, it is well-deserving of its place in this noble company.

A short but valuable introduction is provided by Dr. Hugh Martin, and in it we read those facts about the author and the book which enable the reader to appreciate its significance. George Herbert died in 1633 before he reached the age of forty. Only the last three years of his life were given to the work of the Christian ministry. Before that, he had sought eminence in high social circles, until it was brought home to him that he was evading God's call to the ministry of the Church. Once he yielded to the pressure of God upon his life, however, he committed himself with utter abandon to this high calling, longing to be able to make up in some way for the earlier wasted years.

Perhaps Herbert is better known to most readers by his poems than by his prose writing. Some of these have secured a place in modern hymn books, and a short selection from them is included at the end of this volume. The main part, however, is given to his essay on the Work of the Christian Minister, 'The Country Parson' (though in some old editions it is called 'The Priest to the Temple'). His aim in writing it, he tells us, was not so much to instruct others as to set a standard for himself, 'to set down the form and character of a true Pastor, that I may have a mark to aim at. . . . Not that I think if a man do not all which is here expressed, he presently sins and displeases God, but that it is a good strife to go as far as we can in pleasing of him who hath done so much for us.' But in setting a standard for himself, he sets one for others too.

There is much here that will speak to the heart of every minister, calling him back to his task with

new devotion, administering rebuke, encouragement and guidance, bringing both tears to his eyes and smiles to his lips. Let Herbert speak for himself: 'A Pastor is the deputy of Christ for the reducing of man to the obedience of God.' 'The Parson is in God's stead to his parish.' 'Nothing is little in God's service . . . wherefore the Parson disdaineth not to enter into the poorest cottage, though he even creep into it, and though it smell never so loathsomely. For both God is there, and also those for whom God died.' There are 'two things in sermons, the one informing, the other inflaming.' 'Instructions seasoned with pleasantness both enter sooner and root deeper.' 'Pleasantness of disposition is of great use.' 'There is no greater sign of holiness than the procuring and rejoicing in another's good.' 'Do well and right, and let the world sink.'

Any minister who has not read this book would be wise to buy it, read it, underline and remember it, for here the author, as Richard Baxter wrote of him, 'speaks to God like one that really believeth in God, and whose business in this world is most with God.'

C. L. Mitton

Instruction in Preaching

Preaching, like everything else, has its technique. Inspirational books on preaching doubtless have their value; but a book which deals in the most fearlessly practical way with the technique of preaching is very nearly worth its weight in gold. Such a book is *Principles and Practice of Preaching*, by Professor Ilion T. Jones (Abingdon Press; $3.75).

Dr. Jones writes: 'This book is written primarily for the minister who is eager to learn to preach well and is willing, in a normal preaching situation, to pay the price of the learning.' The book assumes no low view of preaching. Preaching is God's 'saving approach to the souls of men and women.' Preaching, as J. R. P. Sclater said, 'is truth strained through a human personality.' 'The main function of a sermon is to interpret to men the mind of God as it is revealed in the mind of Christ.' Preaching, H. E. Fosdick has said, 'is drenching a congregation with one's life-blood.'

There is never any room for satisfaction in preaching. 'I must be going downhill,' said Thorvaldsen, the illustrious sculptor, 'when I find my work equal to my aspirations.' Once a man is satisfied, to use Walter Winchell's phrase, 'he's rusting on his laurels.'

Inevitably a man will sometimes get discouraged. As Fosdick said, the effects of preaching often seem as uncertain as 'discharging an eye dropper out of a window into the street below in hope that the eye medicine will hit somebody in the right place.' H. W. Beecher said: 'The churches of the land are sprinkled all over with bald-headed old sinners whose hair has been worn off by the friction of countless sermons that have been aimed at them and have glanced off and hit the man in the pew behind.'

Dr. Jones distinguishes certain purposes in preaching. They are: To make people God-conscious; To translate the gospel into modern thought terms; To show the relevancy of the gospel to human situations; To persuade men to believe the gospel and live by it; To offer hope to sinful men. As an example of the practicality of this book we may quote his suggested steps in sermon preparation. (1) Select the text, and general subject, or idea for the sermon. (2) Put the subconscious mind to work. (3) Browse in your library and gather material. (4) Brood over the material. (5) Settle upon the specific subject and theme and exact purpose. (6) Make a tentative outline. (7) Prepare a complete detailed outline. (8) Fill in the outline with ideas and illustrations. (9) Write out the sermon in full. (10) Revise and reshape. (11) Get the sermon into your system. (12) Prepare yourself.

A. W. Blackwood has said that sermon subjects tend to suffer from 'sameness, tameness, and lameness.' Augustine gave as his advice for preaching: 'Make the truth plain; make the truth pleasing; make the truth moving.' There is no doubt that this book will do much to change the fault into the virtue.

The book will even supply illustrations of how not to do it. A certain Professor of Homiletics offered to his students the following outline for a sermon on the Prodigal Son. I. His madness. (*a*) He cavilled. (*b*) He travelled, (*c*) He revelled. II. His sadness. (*a*) He went to the dogs, (*b*) He lost his togs, (*c*) He ate with the hogs. III. His gladness. (*a*) He got the seal, (*b*) He ate the veal. (*c*) He danced the reel. Comment is unnecessary.

For all its practicalness this book never forgets the personal element. George Herbert said: 'You are in God's stead in your parish.' The man of God is never in this book lost in technique.

I wish that twenty-five years ago some one had put a book like this into my hands.

William Barclay

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.